

National forest primitive areas to be reviewed for permanent protection as wilderness and areas of the national park system and national wildlife ranges and refuges containing roadless areas to be reviewed for preservation as wilderness, with gross acreages—Continued

	Gross acreage
Idaho, Idaho.....	1,232,744
Mission Mountains, Mont.....	75,500
Mount Baldy, Ariz.....	7,400
Mount Jefferson, Oreg.....	88,700
North Cascade, Wash.....	801,000
Pine Mountain, Ariz.....	17,500
Popo Agie, Wyo.....	70,000
Salmon River Breaks, Idaho.....	217,185
Salmon Trinity Alps, Calif.....	285,756
San Juan, Colo.....	240,000
San Rafael, Calif.....	74,990
Sawtooth, Idaho.....	200,942
South Warner, Calif.....	70,682
Spanish Peaks, Mont.....	50,000
Stratified, Wyo.....	202,000
Sycamore Canyon, Ariz.....	47,230
Uncompahgre, Colo.....	69,263
Upper Rio Grande, Colo.....	56,600
Ventana, Calif.....	54,857
Wilson Mountains, Colo.....	27,347

Total acreage in national forest "primitive areas"..... 6,121,812

NATIONAL PARKS CONTAINING AREAS OF WILDERNESS, WITH TOTAL GROSS ACREAGE OF EACH PARK

Acadia, Maine.....	41,634
Big Bend, Tex.....	708,221
Bryce Canyon, Utah.....	36,010
Carlsbad Caverns, N.M.....	49,448
Crater Lake, Oreg.....	160,290
Everglades, Fla.....	1,400,533
Glacier, Mont.....	1,013,129
Grand Canyon, Ariz.....	673,575
Grand Teton, Wyo.....	310,350

Great Smoky Mountains, N.C.....	275,332
Great Smoky Mountains, Tenn.....	236,346

Total..... 511,678

Haleakala, Hawaii.....	26,403
Hawaii, Hawaii.....	220,345
Isle Royale, Mich.....	539,339
Kings Canyon, Calif.....	454,650
Lassen Volcanic, Calif.....	105,922
Mammoth Cave, Ky.....	51,354
Mesa Verde, Colo.....	51,334
Mount McKinley, Alaska.....	1,939,493
Mount Rainier, Wash.....	241,782
Olympic, Wash.....	896,599
Petrified Forest, Ariz.....	94,161
Rocky Mountain, Colo.....	260,018
Sequoia, Calif.....	386,551
Shenandoah, Va.....	211,325
Wind Cave, S. Dak.....	28,059

Yellowstone, Idaho.....	31,488
Yellowstone, Mont.....	151,068
Yellowstone, Wyo.....	2,039,217

Total..... 2,221,773

Yosemite, Calif.....	760,951
Zion, Utah.....	147,035

Acreage in National Parks..... 13,541,962

NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

Theodore Roosevelt, N. Dak.....	70,374
---------------------------------	--------

NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREA

Cape Hatteras, N.C.....	28,500
-------------------------	--------

National forest primitive areas to be reviewed for permanent protection as wilderness and areas of the national park system and national wildlife ranges and refuges containing roadless areas to be reviewed for preservation as wilderness, with gross acreages—Continued

NATIONAL MONUMENTS CONTAINING AREAS OF WILDERNESS, WITH TOTAL GROSS ACREAGE OF EACH MONUMENT

	Gross acreage
Arches, Utah.....	34,250
Badlands, S. Dak.....	111,530
Black Canyon of the Gunnison, Colo.....	13,548
Capitol Reef, Utah.....	39,173
Channel Islands, Calif.....	13,167
Chiricahua, Ariz.....	10,646
Craters of the Moon, Idaho.....	48,184
Colorado, Colo.....	17,693

Death Valley, Calif.....	1,792,520
Death Valley, Nev.....	115,240

Total..... 1,907,760

Dinosaur, Colo.....	152,259
Dinosaur, Utah.....	53,038

Total..... 205,297

Glacier Bay, Alaska.....	2,274,595
Grand Canyon, Ariz.....	198,280
Joshua Tree, Calif.....	557,935
Katmai, Alaska.....	2,697,590
Lava Beds, Calif.....	46,239
Organ Pipe Cactus, Ariz.....	330,874
Saguaro, Ariz.....	63,284
White Sands, N. Mex.....	146,535

Acreage in National Monuments..... 8,721,500

NATIONAL WILDLIFE RANGES CONTAINING AREAS OF WILDERNESS, WITH TOTAL GROSS ACREAGE OF EACH RANGE

Arctic National Wildlife Range, Alaska.....	8,900,000
Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Ariz.....	860,000
Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, Nev.....	543,898
Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Range, Alaska.....	1,890,000
Desert Game Range, Nev.....	2,188,415
Fort Peck Game Range, Mont.....	950,827
Izembek National Wildlife Range, Alaska.....	415,000
Kenai National Moose Range, Alaska.....	2,057,197
Kofa Game Range, Ariz.....	600,000
Montana National Bison Range, Mont.....	18,541

Acreage in national wildlife ranges..... 18,483,878

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES CONTAINING AREAS OF WILDERNESS, WITH TOTAL GROSS ACREAGE OF EACH REFUGE

Aleutian Islands, Alaska.....	2,720,235
Bogoslof, Alaska (an island).....	390
Aransas, Tex.....	47,261
Cape Roman, S.C.....	34,716
Delta, La.....	48,834
Kodiak, Alaska.....	1,815,000
Moosehorn, Maine.....	22,565
Nunivak, Alaska.....	1,109,384
Okefenokee, Ga.....	330,973
Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, Mont.....	39,943
Seney, Mich.....	95,531
Sheldon National Antelope Refuge, Nev.....	34,131
Wichita Mountains, Okla.....	59,019

Acreage in national wildlife refuges..... 6,357,982

National forest primitive areas to be reviewed for permanent protection as wilderness and areas of the national park system and national wildlife ranges and refuges containing roadless areas to be reviewed for preservation as wilderness, with gross acreages—Continued

SUMMARY, NATIONAL FOREST PRIMITIVE AREAS AND AREAS CONTAINING WILDERNESS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AND IN WILDLIFE REFUGES AND RANGES

	Gross acreage
National forest primitive areas (36).....	6,121,812
National parks (28).....	13,541,962
National monuments (18).....	8,721,500
National memorial park (1).....	70,374
National seashore recreation area (1).....	28,500

Gross acreage in national park system..... 22,362,336

National wildlife ranges (10).....	18,483,878
National wildlife refuges (13).....	6,357,982

Gross acreage in national wildlife and ranges..... 24,841,860

Total gross acreage (107 areas)..... 53,326,008

STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere, appointed by the House Republican policy committee early this year to make a continuing study of one of our most serious foreign policy problems, has authorized me to issue a comprehensive report.

I have the honor to serve as chairman of this special committee along with the following members: Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida; Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Representative SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Ohio; Representative DURWARD C. HALL, of Missouri; Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; and Representative GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas.

This committee has issued four earlier statements. Its present report contains seven policy recommendations which the members of the special committee believe to be essential for the security of this Nation and of our Latin American neighbors.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUBA AND SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

One year has passed since the Cuban missile crisis. At this time 1 year ago the momentary firmness of the Kennedy administration was dissolving as at least some Soviet missiles and medium-range bombers were withdrawn from Cuba. Administration spokesmen unleashed a barrage of propaganda heavy with self-congratulation and the assertion of the "inherent right of government to lie" in time of crisis. And then the administration proceeded to sweep Cuban affairs under the rug.

Now there is a danger that some half-measure such as a reduction of Soviet troop strength in Cuba or the transformation of Castro into a Latin Tito will be accepted by the administration as a satisfactory solution of the Cuban problem.

The aim of the policy of the United States must be nothing less than the establishment of freedom in Cuba. This precludes a Communist regime there.

SOME EVENTS OF THE PAST YEAR

While the Kennedy administration has been busy curbing attacks on Castro's Cuba by Cuban exiles, Castro has spent the past year spreading sabotage and destruction throughout Latin America.

In February 1963, Castro's Mig's— which the administration regards as defensive equipment—attacked an unarmed U.S. shrimp boat.

In March, Castro's defensive aircraft fired on the United States ship *The Floridian* as it made its way from San Juan to Miami.

In March, Castro's forces were reported by two eyewitness exiles to have invaded the British island of Cay Sal and to have kidnapped from there eight people.

In August, two patrol boats and a helicopter from Cuba invaded a small island in the British Bahamas and kidnapped 19 hapless Cubans who had sought refuge from Castro's tyranny. Jet fighters of the U.S. Navy and a patrol plane of the Coast Guard hovered overhead for 2 hours as Castro's forces rounded up the refugees, forced them aboard the vessels, and returned them to an uncertain fate in the country from which they had fled.

In October, an American-owned freighter, the *J. Louis*, was attacked by Cuban planes in international waters between Cuba and Florida.

These incidents are cited because they have occurred close to the United States. They constitute only a minor part of an unrelenting campaign of subversion and terrorism which communism is carrying on in this hemisphere. By such tactics the Communists hope to bring to power other Castros in other Latin American States.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CUBA

The subversive activity of communism in Latin America antedates the accession of Castro to power. Eleven years before he marched into Havana, Castro himself participated in the "bogotazo"—the uprising in Bogotá designed to disrupt the Inter-American Conference at Bogotá in 1948. Undoubtedly Communist subversion in the Americas would continue if the Castro regime were replaced by an anti-Communist government.

Nevertheless a Communist Cuba is of crucial importance to Moscow as a base for campaign of subversive activity in Latin America.

Cuba is important because of its location, because it is Latin, but most of all Cuba is important because it is a symbol of success. Communists in other Latin American countries have only to look at Cuba to know that their cause can triumph, that they will be protected by Khrushchev, and that all the huffing and

puffing that the United States is prepared to engage in will not blow their house down.

A special committee designated by the Organization of American States to study the problem of Communist subversion in the hemisphere reported on June 4, 1963:

Undoubtedly, Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America.

THE TACTICS OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN LATIN AMERICA

Communist Cuba has made no secret of its objective in Latin America. On July 26, 1963, Castro called for revolution throughout the hemisphere. Armando Hart, Castro's Minister of Education, declared:

In Latin America the conquest of revolutionary power has to be achieved—at least in a great number of countries—through class struggle carried to the level of armed insurrection by the proletariat and peasant classes.

Thelma King, Castro's principal agent in Panama, has said:

There is one goal: To take over power, either by elections or by force; but it must be taken over.

Barely 2 months after taking power, Castro began a series of armed forays against the countries of the Caribbean, including the island of Salt Key in the British Bahamas. After the failure of these initial probes, Castro's tactics changed from invasion to a combination of propaganda and internal terrorism. Even in the United States, such activity has been carried on. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been the propaganda agency. And, in November 1962, a plot to disrupt oil installations in New Jersey led to the expulsion of two Cuban diplomats accredited to the United Nations.

It is unnecessary to recount in detail here in the campaign of violent subversive activity inspired by Cuba which has touched every nation in this hemisphere and has led most of the nations of Latin America to break off diplomatic relations with the Castro Government.

At the Punta del Este Conference of January 1962, the Organization of American States established a Special Consultative Committee on Security Against the Subversive Activities of International Communism. This Committee has issued valuable factual reports and offered recommendations for action which have not in general been effectively implemented. Indeed, on July 3, 1963, five Latin American States failed to vote in the OAS for recommendations to curb travel to Cuba and better coordinate the security measures of individual countries.

Cuba feeds the fires of subversion throughout Latin America in three principal ways: training agents, providing propaganda, and supplying funds.

The OAS Committee has reported that "at least 1,500 persons from the other American Republics traveled to Cuba during 1962" for instruction in the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, as well as in propaganda techniques and Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The faculty of schools of this type, the committee found, includes Russians, Chinese, and Czechoslovaks in ad-

dition to Latin Americans. The results of the training can be seen almost daily in the dispatches from Venezuela, Colombia, and other American Republics.

Books, newspapers, pamphlets, and radio transmit a steady flow of propaganda from Cuba. The Cuban news agency, Prensa Latina, is perhaps the most important vehicle for the dissemination of the Communist message to the mass audience in Central and South America.

The subversive activities carried on by Communists demand expenditures which are substantial in comparison with those of non-Communist political groups in the countries concerned. The OAS Committee reported:

It is the present Cuban Government that is responsible for providing, directly or indirectly, a large part of the funds received by the Communist parties in the other American Republics.

THE DANGER OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

If additional non-Communist nations in this hemisphere succumb to communism, the transition probably will be made in the classic tradition in Latin America—through subversive activity culminating in a swift palace revolution early some morning. It is unlikely that Castro would be so foolhardy as to launch a full-scale invasion by his troops against any of his neighbors. The peril that Latin American governments face is subversion from within, inspired and supported from Cuba.

In at least half a dozen Latin American countries, unstable governments present a tempting target to Castro.

The six revolutions that have taken place in Latin America since the disaster of the Bay of Pigs emphasize an important fact. The weakness that places a government at the mercy of a few military leaders may place it at the mercy of a few Communists. A small well-organized band of Communists might have engineered the coup d'etat as speedily as did a small organized band of military leaders.

There is need for more effective action against the specific forms of subversion and terrorism which the Castros employ. But the only fully effective way to put an end to Castro's subversion is by getting rid of Castro.

The recommendations which follow have this as their aim.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

First. The United States must return to the Monroe Doctrine.

The first step in the formulation of policy is determination of the objective. The Communist government of Cuba exists in defiance of the historic policy of the United States barring intervention by extrahemispheric powers in the affairs of the Republics of the Americas. At Caracas in 1954 the members of the OAS endorsed this policy. Until the President and the Congress reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine and make it clear that a Communist government will not be tolerated in this hemisphere, there will be a continuation of the indecision and inaction on the part of the United States, which confuses our friends and emboldens our enemies to push further into the Americas.

Second. The United States must give high priority to the task of defeating communism in Latin America and must provide vigorous leadership in this task.

The Kennedy administration has placed the most urgent of Latin American problems far down the list of its pressing concerns. Failure to assign high priority to the problem of communism in Latin America has resulted in reluctance to exercise the leadership which most other American Republics have been seeking from the United States.

It is now almost 2 months since the American Ambassador to the OAS resigned, and there is still no word from the White House about a successor. The last Ambassador was not an experienced diplomat nor was he equipped with any special knowledge of Latin America. It was commonly recognized that his position with the OAS was in the nature of an interim appointment until he could run again for the governorship of his State, a post which he had sought unsuccessfully 4 years ago.

The Kennedy administration has not pushed for united action against the Communist threat in this hemisphere. Except at the time of the crisis of October 1962—when the OAS unanimously supported the blockade of Cuba—the United States has not shown leadership. At Punta del Este in 1962, the delegations of Central America had to stiffen the backbone of the spokesmen of the United States in support of a strong anti-Communist statement. For want of interest on the part of the United States, the OAS has never followed up a resolution of the Punta del Este Conference calling for a study of means of curbing trade in nonstrategic items between Cuba and other nations of the hemisphere.

In order to arrive at a consistent and effective policy, our Government must put the task of defeating communism in Latin America near the top of foreign policy objectives. Otherwise, reasons will always be found to do nothing about Castro.

In the policy adopted to defeat communism, the United States should act in cooperation with as much of the community of American Republics as possible. This Nation cannot permit what is called public opinion in some other nation to exercise a veto over a course of policy that is clearly needed for security and freedom in the hemisphere. But, to the extent possible, the policy should be the joint policy of the free American Republics, and not the unilateral policy of the United States. The principal obstacle to fixing on a joint policy is not the unwillingness of other Latin American states to participate, but the inability or unwillingness of the Kennedy administration to lead.

Ambassador Gonzalo J. Facio, Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, made this point on February 24, 1963:

The OAS cannot have a definite policy without knowing what the policy of the United States is.

Third. The United States must make a maximum effort toward complete isolation of Communist Cuba.

Because of policies adopted under the Eisenhower administration some strain has been placed on Castro's economy by a reduction of trade with the United States and other free world nations. Much more should be done.

Fifty percent of the ships that travel to Cuba are free world ships. In 1962 Cuba still obtained 20 percent of its imports from free world nations. This committee repeats the recommendations made in an earlier report that aid be denied to nations trading with Cuba and that all vessels of any nation that permits any of its ships to engage in Cuban trade be barred from U.S. ports.

A ruling of the Comptroller General makes it clear that the administration has flagrantly violated the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963 in extending aid to at least some of the nations whose ships are transporting goods between the Soviet Union and Cuba. We call on the administration to observe the law.

In addition to trade, travel between Cuba and the free world should be cut off. The interruption of travel between Cuba and states of this hemisphere would seriously cripple subversive activity in Latin America by stopping the training of terrorists in Cuba.

A determined attempt should be made by the United States and the other nations which have broken diplomatic ties with the Castro government to lead the five holdout nations to follow their example. The principal function of a Cuban Embassy is to serve as a center for the direction of subversion in the nation in which it is located.

None of the foregoing recommendations would affect relations between Cuba and the Communist bloc although adoption of them would make the support of Cuba more costly for the bloc countries.

We regret the failure of President Kennedy to hold fast to his decision to blockade Cuba until on-site inspection of the island to verify the removal of missiles was secured. We do not, however, possess enough information to decide whether a blockade of any kind should be reinstituted at this time. If any significant flow of troops or military equipment is moving to Cuba from Communist bloc nations, we would favor the imposition of a partial blockade to turn back such shipments. In this, as in the other steps we recommend, we prefer joint action by a number of American nations to unilateral action by the United States.

Fourth. The United States and other American Republics should withdraw recognition of the Castro government and recognize a provisional government to lead the Cuban people to freedom.

Although the United States broke diplomatic relations with Castro under the Eisenhower administration, it still recognizes the Castro government as the legitimate Government of Cuba. This recognition should be ended in order to make possible the recognition of a provisional government.

Cuba must be freed by Cubans, not by Americans. The fragmented and uncoordinated efforts of dozens of resistance groups within Cuba and of exile groups without are wasteful and less than fully effective. Consequently, uni-

fication of activity under the leadership of a provisional government is essential.

When Cuba becomes free, this government should be succeeded by one freely chosen by the Cuban people.

Fifth. A coordinated campaign of guerrilla warfare and sabotage launched by Cubans from within and from outside Cuba should be undertaken with the support of the United States and other American Republics.

It is possible that discontent within Cuba will mount to a point which Castro can be overthrown as Batista was overthrown without even a forcible push.

If, as seems more likely, the hope of the great majority of Cubans for freedom can be realized only by fighting for it, the United States should help in planning, organizing, supplying, and otherwise supporting the effort of free Cubans.

The vulnerability of Castro to the kind of sabotage which he supports in other Latin American nations is obvious. To cite one example, the destruction of the three major oil refineries in Cuba would speedily produce complete chaos throughout the island.

Sixth. The United States and other American Republics cannot permit British Guiana to achieve independence under a Communist government.

There is grave danger to the hemisphere in a British Guiana ruled by the Communist regime of Cheddi Jagan. The Jagan government, which came to power with the support of a minority of the electorate, is now a trouble spot under some kind of control by the United Kingdom. As an independent state, it would be a serious danger to its neighbors. We welcome the recent decision of the United Kingdom to delay independence until British Guinea has a government representative of a majority of its people.

Seventh. The United States should continue to assist other American Republics to achieve the economic progress and political stability that undergird freedom.

This committee recognizes the need for drastic reform throughout Latin America in order to provide a bulwark against communism or other forms of dictatorship. Mass poverty and ignorance create an instability which the demagog can readily exploit.

We recognize a relation between social and economic progress in Latin America and the defeat of communism. The most important reform in our estimation is the establishment of universal education in Latin America. But a program of social and economic reform will not be enough in itself to cope with the immediate danger. Reform at best will come slowly. The threat is here and now. The danger is not that a Communist government will anywhere be installed by voluntary action of a majority of the people but that it will be imposed by force by a minority. And so, while we support efforts to improve social and economic conditions, we cannot regard them as the answer to Castro.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CELLER (at the

20360

request of Mr. ADDABBO), for Thursday, November 7, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, for 45 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. BATTIN, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REIFEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. MOORE in three instances.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. CRAMER in four instances.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. CHENOWETH.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. JOHANSEN in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. NORBLAD in two instances.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. TUTEN), notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be \$210 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TUTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in 10 instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. FARSTEIN in three instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. MORRISON in three instances.

Mr. BOGGS.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1989. An act to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7405. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock; and

H.R. 8821. An act to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1357. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1358. A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, transmitting the first report of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, pursuant to Public Law 87-256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations for the period July 1 through September 30, 1963, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1360. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U.S.C. 14); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 7381. A bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No.

890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8135. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 9009. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to Southeast Asia (Oct. 3-19, 1963); without amendment (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN:
 H.R. 9069. A bill to amend section 201 of the Antidumping Act, 1921, with respect to the determination of injury or threatened injury to an industry in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:
 H.R. 9070. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:
 H.R. 9071. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of Government employees in positions incorrectly classified under the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:
 H.R. 9072. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Improvement of St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANKFORD:
 H.R. 9073. A bill to permit certain lands in Prince Georges County, Md., granted to the State of Maryland for National Guard purposes to be used for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
 H.R. 9074. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT: *FILE*
 H.R. 9075. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:
 H.R. 9076. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLIER:
 H.R. 9077. A bill to amend title I—Tariff Schedules of the United States, of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 to correct certain inequities in the classification and duty provided for certain aluminum products, television picture tubes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:
 H.R. 9078. A bill to amend the National Housing Act with respect to water and sewerage facilities and mortgage insurance

dent Kennedy; and a guest-of-honor role at the People's World silver anniversary last January 26 in San Francisco.

A giant East Bay benefit staged by the Berkeley Friends of Highlander, February 9, was arranged in part by Mrs. Treuhart (Tocsin, Feb. 27, 1963). Funds went to the Communist-backed Highlander Research and Education Center of Knoxville, Tenn.

Called before the California Senate Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities in September 1951, Mrs. Treuhart refused to answer all questions about her affiliations in the bay area on grounds that her answers might tend to incriminate her. Her refusal evoked laughter when, after declining a question about the Communist Civil Rights Congress, she similarly refused to acknowledge membership in even the Berkeley Tennis Club.

WE HAVE BEEN SOLD A BILL OF GOODS IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG], is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Latin America is of vital importance to the future security of the United States in her struggle, along with her neighbors to the south, against the colonialism of the Soviet empire. We are facing a critical stage in the cold war at which this Government must not be found wanting in its determination to save not only our own people but the people of Latin America and the Caribbean from the totalitarian policies of a power-mad group of opportunists who would fasten their concepts of atheistic materialistic dictatorship upon the unsuspecting people of the world. While those how are a part of this international conspiracy cry "peace" and "brotherhood of man," and by corruption of words claim only to want to save the world from economic chaos and nuclear holocaust, let it be clear that they do not and indeed cannot talk about freedom. Nowhere in the world have the people by free elections chosen a Communist ballot and likewise nowhere in the world where Communist tyranny has fastened itself upon the people have the people been offered a free choice to repudiate it. Those who are outright, active, supporters of the international conspiracy to enslave all humankind under their godless banner, claiming to want to lift humanity out of the dregs into which they have fallen because of their innate and tenacious faith in a divine Creator, would have us believe that all who oppose them, oppose people; that all who oppose their diabolical policies of double dealing are warmongers and greedy capitalists and imperialists. Those who oppose them are rightwing extremists—are parasites feeding off those who work to make a living.

It is because I believe that our future as a free nation is tied up intimately with the interests of our traditional and welcome friends in the other Americas; it is because I believe that our aid to the people in Latin America who have become pawns on the chessboard of inter-

national communism, must be directed to the end that they can be spared the fate of the unfortunate people of other captive nations the Soviets so blatantly would have the world believe have been liberated; it is because the future of our culture and civilization with the emphasis on the worth of individuals, the dignity of man, the sense of divine direction, is seriously threatened by the inroads the Communist conspiracy has made in our hemisphere; it is because I believe a forthright presentation of all points of view are necessary if we are not to find ourselves overrun by the conspiracy, posing under another name, entering the back window, that I take the floor today to present what I have gleaned from serious study and many conversations with various thinking people from Latin America.

I give this point of view because I believe the time is late and unless we break the information barrier created by managed news which is succeeding in its efforts to camouflage facts, distort truth, and withhold information needed to make a true assessment of conditions and circumstances as they are, we may find ourselves victims of the very conspiracy against which we are led to believe we have been waging a cold war.

In view of recent developments in the Dominican Republic, it is evident that the Kennedy administration has again muffed the ball in Latin America. The military coups in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras have revealed agonizingly that the administration, despite its talk about the success of the Alliance for Progress, is almost completely adrift in its Latin American policy. It is being buffeted about by political forces in our neighbor countries which it neither foresaw nor knows how to influence.

Since this administration took over the White House in 1961, there seems to have been some fatality which has turned every one of its Latin American moves into blundering and bitter failures. The most ghastly of these, of course, has been the Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba, followed by the incredible pledge of no invasion to Castro after the missile crisis of 1962. But while the most glaring example of the failure of the policies of this administration in Latin America because it is so obvious, Cuba is not an isolated indication of failure. The same forcible-feeble approach—today a threat, tomorrow a cringe—has characterized our policy in practically every Latin American situation. At the end of 2½ years of repeated and unbroken bungling in this hemisphere, this administration stands before the world an abject and pathetic object of confusion and retreat.

In the case of the Dominican Republic, there was not the slightest excuse for the Kennedy administration to put its unqualified support behind the Juan Bosch regime. Throughout the 7 months of Bosch's rule, Washington seemed to deliberately blind itself to Dominican realities. The administration sent to the Dominican Republic as Ambassador a magazine writer, John Bartlow Martin, who was undoubtedly well intentioned,

but whose apparent sole claim to diplomatic appointment was the fact that he had been a ghostwriter for Adlai Stevenson. Upon Mr. Martin's advice, Washington accepted Juan Bosch as the best bet for the United States in the Dominican Republic. Even after he was recalled, following the military coup, Martin returned to Washington to defend Bosch, although he made it clear that he had only been following instructions. Nor did Mr. Martin attach importance to a fact which was commonly known in the Dominican Republic—that Bosch was a confirmed anti-American.

Bosch's first act as President was to go to Switzerland and contract for a \$150 million loan from a Swiss consortium at 6¼ percent interest, rather than obtain available financing from U.S. agencies which reportedly would have given him a three-quarters of 1 percent rate.

Pan American Headlines, published by the Committee on Pan American Policy, gave this account of the deal:

In early January 1963, before he was sworn in as President, Bosch announced that he was going to take a trip to Europe to get aid for the nation's economy. Bosch selected three men: Diego Borda, Pedro Juan Laboy, Mario Diez.

Bosch disclosed that he was going to secure a large loan to finance the fantastic program of public improvements which he had promised in his campaign. At the time, he was advised that Washington would supply him with the money which he needed at a nominal rate of interest of three-quarters of 1 percent. Bosch told his associates that he didn't want American money because he did not want the United States to have any hold on him. This chauvinistic gesture silenced his home critics who were mystified by his insistence on getting European aid.

Bosch and his trio journeyed to Switzerland where Mario Diez had arranged a meeting with a Swiss consortium. The consortium granted a loan of \$150 million. The interest rate which Bosch accepted on this loan was 6.25 percent. Which means that the Dominican Republic was obligated to pay in excess interest \$8 million more, per annum, than it would have paid to the proposed American lender.

But there was worse to follow.

It came to light that Bosch borrowed from the consortium an advance of \$15 million, giving notes for the amount. Shortly afterward, these notes made their appearance in the money markets of various countries, as the head of the consortium tried to discount them. Some of them were discounted by the General Electric Co. of London. Others were offered to the Lock Joint Pipe Co., but were refused.

To this day, despite the repeated demand of the nonradical Dominican press, Bosch and Borda have not made an accounting of the \$15 million.

Yet we decided to throw the prestige of the United States behind the Bosch government.

If Ambassador Martin had listened to the responsible people in the Dominican Republic, instead of those in the narrow leftist circle, he would have known that a great part of the Dominican population had already stamped Bosch unreliable from the standpoint of democracy and of individual as well as national progress. He would have known of the rampant corruption which was corroding away the confidence of the

No one had ever explained to me that you had to pay for electricity; and lights, electric heaters, stoves blazed away night and day at Rotherhithe Street. When the enormous bill first arrived we thought briefly of contesting it in court on the grounds that electricity is an act of God—an element, like fire, earth, and air; but legal friends assured us this would get us nowhere. It was unthinkable that we should pay, so we moved out of the Rotherhithe Street house to a furnished room near the Marble Arch.

On page 207 she writes:

One evening at dinner, after they had him on the ropes, I was emboldened by this unfamiliar relationship between old and young to ask, "But surely, Mr. Meyer, you're not in favor of capitalism, are you?"

Again, referring to her first husband, on page 280 she says:

His [Esmond's] brand of socialism was uncluttered by fine Christian sentiments, for like Boud he was a gifted hater, although unlike her he directed his venom against the enemies of humanity, peace and freedom.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the woman being defended by the so-called liberals while they denounced me for attempting to expose her.

I said that I was not surprised at the New York Times or even the San Francisco Chronicle or even the Oceanside (Calif.) Blade Tribune, or the El Cajon (Calif.) Valley News, all of which mimicked each other, nor was I surprised to find that the Democratic Committee of Escondido, Calif., bought space to have the editorial in the New York Times printed in the Escondido Times Advocate as an advertisement. Of course, as expected, the Communist People's World, Saturday, November 2, 1963, leveled a typical attack upon me quoting liberally from the New York Times. I was surprised to find so many solid newspapers in the country such as the Orange (Calif.) Daily News and the Daily Pilot (Costa Mesa, Calif.), and others, arising to the defense of this woman who has done more to destroy the soul of America than almost anyone else, and I am wondering if, after they have the facts as presented here, they will continue to place her on a pedestal.

When Jessica Mitford Romilly Treuhافت was questioned about my remarks in the Record, she dismissed them airily with the remark that it was nothing but a "red herring." Where have I heard that before? As I recall, a former President used that phrase concerning the charges brought against persons both in and out of the Federal Government, who were later convicted as spies, Communists and traitors.

Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I said that the charge of congressional immunity was hogwash, and as further evidence of this, I ask unanimous consent to include herewith an article appearing in Tocsin, August 28, 1963, printed at Berkeley, Calif. This is only one of several magazine articles carrying similar charges.

WRITER JESSICA MITFORD EQUALS COMMUNIST DECCA TREUHAF

Simon and Schuster has just published a new book by Oakland resident, Jessica Mitford of 6411 Regent Street, entitled "The American Way of Death," a clever attempt to bury capitalist America's funeral customs.

Absent from the superficially plausible case which the author makes in her sharply satirical lampoon are biographical data about Miss Mitford which could place the book's thesis in new perspective for the unwary reader.

For Writer Jessica Mitford is also Decca Treuhافت, wife of Oakland Communist lawyer Robert E. Treuhافت and herself an often-identified Communist Party member. It is as Decca Treuhافت that the writer has performed her service for the Communist Party.

Despite the book's innocent air of indignation at the purported crass commercialism of American funerals and the author's proposal for "grassroots" type remedies, Mrs. Treuhافت is no newcomer to the role of opponent of American institutions.

As executive secretary of the subversive East Bay Civil Rights Congress in the 1950's, she kept local law enforcement agencies busy with assorted cases of "police brutality" and "racial discrimination"—all pivoting on well-oiled Communist propaganda machinery and fully exploited by the People's World.

One of the seemingly innocuous solutions Mrs. Treuhافت proposes for the funeral problem is organization of local memorial associations which would provide low-cost burials. Two such associations in southern and northern California (reported in Tocsin, March 8 and May 1, 1963) have strong Communist and leftwing backing. They are the Bay Area Funeral Society of Berkeley and the Los Angeles Funeral Society.

British-born and bred, Mrs. Treuhافت arrived in the United States in 1939 following a youthful elopement to Spain with Esmond Romilly, a nephew of Winston Churchill, who had fought with the pro-Communist forces in the Spanish Civil War.

Mrs. Treuhافت is the sister of Nancy Mitford, acid-tongued novelist always severely critical of the United States; Unity Freeman Mitford, Hitler's onetime "Nordic Goddess"; Lady Diana Mosley, wife of Sir Oswald Mosley, England's leading Fascist; Pamela Mitford, wife of a distinguished British scientist; and Deborah Mitford, wife of the Duke of Devonshire.

Mrs. Treuhافت's penchant for doing the unexpected—plus her kinship—have won her several treatments in Bay Area supplements, where her interest in leftwing politics has been viewed as frivolous unconventionality at most. Interpreting her elopement with Romilly as a defiance of her rightwing background, the San Francisco Examiner of February 19, 1961, declared, "The two self-avowed Communists continued their fight against the uppercrust society from which they had fled."

REBELLIOUS DAUGHTERS

Mrs. Treuhافت's service to the Communist movement does, in fact, seem to be motivated by the same kind of rebellion her other five sisters had demonstrated in the opposite political direction. "Daughters and Rebels," Mrs. Treuhافت's autobiography published in 1960, dissects the rebellious daughters and their indomitable drives. Even Iron Communist Party discipline, commented one of her readers, cannot confine a "mad Mitford" for very long.

In bay area Communist circles, for example, Mrs. Treuhافت has always carefully associated with communism's upper crust. And despite her ability to subordinate herself to such short-term party goals as "police brutality" drives, Mrs. Treuhافت's statements have never been known to include endorsement of "workers solidarity" or similar Communist propaganda pillars.

A literate and amusing writer, she has aimed her talent for satire at even such sacrosanct Communist techniques as the use of language as a weapon in the class struggle (see "Fun and Games" story, this issue).

After Romilly was killed in World War II, Mrs. Treuhافت met and married Robert Treuh-

haft while both were employees of the Office of Price Administration. At about the same time, she became secretary of San Francisco Local 221 of the United Federal Workers of America, a Communist-dominated union.

LABOR SCHOOL OFFICIAL

In 1944 she assumed the post of financial director for the now defunct Communist California Labor School at its Oakland branch.

Lending their home for various Communist benefits during the years that followed, the Treuhافتs hosted an annual all-night party in August 1949, according to the People's World of August 23.

Most of Mrs. Treuhافت's efforts during the 1950's were devoted to promoting the East Bay Civil Rights Congress. She and her subordinates in the group won "special praise from Albert J. Lima (northern California chairman of the Communist Party) for their fight against the Smith Act," the November 23, 1951, People's World declared.

When the CRC championed Oaklander Jerry Newson in a murder case in 1951, Mrs. Treuhافت even induced her 6-year-old son Nicholas, now deceased, to sell tickets for a Newson benefit. The young child—whom the Treuhافتs had christened with the middle name of Tito, according to the Labor Herald—was arrested for selling tickets.

Together with their son Benjamin and daughter Constanca, the Treuhافتs visited Hungary in the late 1950's and wrote a laudatory account of "life under socialism" for the People's World, February 17, 1957.

IDENTIFIED AS RED

An Independent-Progressive Party voter in 1952 and 1955, Mrs. Treuhافت was identified as a branch and county functionary of the Communist Party by Dickson Hill at December 1953 hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and as a party member by Dr. Jack Patten, June 19, 1957.

She was also identified at 1956 Subversive Activities Control Board hearings on the California Labor School by former Communists William Michael Foard, who said Mrs. Treuhافت was an officer at San Francisco headquarters of the Communist Party, 942 Market Street; Bessie Honing, who had seen Mrs. Treuhافت at a countywide meeting of the Communist Party at Garibaldi Hall; Sylvia G. Hill, who knew her during the early portion of Mrs. Hill's role as an undercover Communist for the FBI; Dorothy M. Jeffers, who identified Mrs. Treuhافت as a party functionary; Timothy Evans, who said she was a member of his section in Alameda County; George William Smith, who identified her as present at an officers meeting in Oakland.

Fired from the San Francisco Chronicle staff after 3 months' work there in 1956, Mrs. Treuhافت nevertheless continued active as a journalist. Her justification of the San Francisco Communist led riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1960 was featured by the Nation magazine.

DISINHERITED, BUT

When the second Lord Redesdale of Great Britain, Mrs. Treuhافت's father, died in March 1958, he cut his Communist daughter from his will. Through a legal fluke, however, Mrs. Treuhافت received as a bequest Inch Kenneth, an island in the Hebrides and site of the family's ancestral castle.

The press reported then that she had broken with her father more than 20 years earlier over the Spanish Civil War question and that her father hated "leftwingers." Mr. Treuhافت, born in New York of Hungarian Jewish parents, ascribed her father's action to anti-Semitism.

Mrs. Treuhافت's more recent Communist activity has included picketing with the local Morton Sobell committee, a group seeking clemency for the condemned atom spy, during the March 1962 visit to Berkeley of Presi-

people. He could have listened to such men as Rafael Bonilla Aybar who was daily reporting the exposé of Bosch's misdeeds over the radio and in his paper, *La Prensa Libre*, to a large and growing audience. He would have talked to such a man as Don Jose Mejia who had suffered unspeakable wrongs under Trujillo and who had returned enthusiastically to the Republic when Bosch was elected, to cooperate with the new President. What he saw under Bosch, however, disenchanted him so completely that he began pouring out a stream of slashing attacks upon the regime in the press and radio. The final weeks of Bosch saw Santo Domingo ringing with the voices of these and many other disillusioned former supporters. Apparently Ambassador Martin didn't hear them. Nor did he understand the significance of the July episode when the leaders of the military warned Bosch that he must mend his ways and clean house, or they would turn against him. The administration in Washington was walking around in such a fogbank that only about 2 weeks before Bosch's fall it induced the Alliance for Progress to offer Bosch a multimillion dollar dam project in the hope of beefing up his popularity.

There was also the questionable Sasha Volman situation. Volman, originally a protege of Norman Thomas and the New York Socialists, had been pursuing a covert and mysterious game in Central America for several years. Former President Otilio Ulate of Costa Rica described Volman as "one of the most dangerous foreigners to have arrived in Costa Rica." Ulate revealed that Volman "handles enormous sums of money, from an unrevealed source, collects a large monthly income, and travels every month to different countries in the Caribbean area."

When Bosch was running for President, Volman appeared in the Dominican Republic and attached himself to Bosch. He apparently acquired a strange ascendancy over Bosch's mind. When the new President was inaugurated, he installed Volman as his adviser on Washington relations. Volman convinced him, truthfully or untruthfully as it may be, that he had great influence with Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and McGeorge Bundy, who have advised the President on Latin American policy. When, in midsummer, a situation arose in which strong elements began to demand that Ambassador Martin be replaced, Volman informed Bosch that he had phoned the White House to one of the President's closest advisers and had saved Martin's job. Bosch believed him.

It is true that Bosch carefully maintained a pose of noncommunism during his Presidency. So, also, did Castro during the first year of his rule in Cuba. But actions speak louder than words.

The OAS has received a document, prepared by Ambassador J. T. Bonilla Atilles, revealing that Dr. Miguel Angel Dominguez Guerra, Bosch's Minister of the Interior and head of the national police, was a "blatant" Castroite and a member of the Partido Socialista Popu-

lar, a Communist front. Other top officials in the Bosch regime whom Dr. Bonilla Atilles named as known Communists or Communist sympathizers were: Luis del Rosairo Ceballos, Minister of Public Works; Miguel Angel Valazques Mainardi, Secretary of the Senate; Diego Bordas, Minister of Industry; Julio Martinez, director of the Government TV-radio station; Ramon Alberto Ferreras Manual, executive in the Government radio network.

It is to be wondered at, that the responsible people of the Dominican Republic felt the shadow of Castro falling over their nation under the rule of such a President?

With such unmistakable portents signaling Bosch's certain collapse, Washington indulged itself in its usual game of wishful thinking. Less than 3 weeks before the coup, the New York Times published a eulogistic article, hailing Bosch as "a reformer with a mission" and declaring that "the Bosch regime had the anxious blessings of the Kennedy administration." So, once again the present administration had been persuaded by its left-minded entourage to go all out for a Communist-coddling regime whose misgovernment was so glaring that its own subjects were turning from it in disgust.

But the most disturbing phase of the Bosch deposition was the wailing and gnashing of teeth which suddenly commenced at the other side of the Capitol when the news reached Washington. One distinguished Senator actually proposed that the U.S. Armed Forces should forcibly take Bosch back to Santo Domingo and restore him to the Presidency, backed by American bayonets. Another learned Senator bluntly proposed that the OAS should set a police force to stop future military uprisings in Latin America. Think of it—an OAS army to dictate to the 20 autonomous and proud Latin American nations what kind of government they should be permitted to have. And in Santo Domingo itself, Spencer M. King, whom Ambassador Martin had left behind as U.S. Chargé d'Affaires, showed his lapse from reality by telling Manuel Tavares Espailat, Member of the Junta, that the United States wanted them to place Juan Cassanovas Garrido in the Presidency in Bosch's place, as the price for recognition. Cassanovas was a henchman of Bosch and at that very time was under investigation by the new government on the charge of complicity in some misappropriations of money of Bosch's administration. How could any clear-thinking American diplomat imagine that a Dominican public which had exiled Bosch would accept another Dominican revolutionary party back in his place?

Perhaps the best statement of the situation which confronted the Dominican people when they expelled Bosch was given by Brig. Gen. Miguel Atila Luna Perez, chief of the Dominican Air Forces. General Luna said:

No one wished to dethrone the government of Juan Bosch. It would have never hap-

pened, had Mr. Bosch been true to his responsibilities of maintaining democratic principles and preserving internal peace. Such internal peace was menaced by the advance (which no one doubted) of Marxism-Leninism, under the protective cloak of a pro-Communist government which did not take any preventive measures against it. This Marxist-Leninist advance became a deadly menace to the traditions of a people who are fundamentally democratic and Christian. There was something else which caused our intervention, and that was the blatant violation of the Constitution of the Republic, and the imminent enactment of a series of laws of typical communistic intent.

Yes, we have certainly goofed in the Dominican Republic. And we will goof again, and even more dangerously, unless we quickly ask ourselves what is really the matter with our Latin American policies.

If the Dominican Republic, as Cuba, stood isolated as a failure in the administration's policy, the incident would be deplorable enough. But unfortunately the Dominican Republic does not stand alone. The Bosch regime was merely one of the arches of the whole structure of U.S.-imposed "left liberal" governments which, it seems quite evident to me, the present administration is trying to set up in the Americas. That it was an important arch is measured by the infuriated outcry which has arisen from the Washington salesmen of that policy since the Dominican people rejected Bosch.

It is high time we reexamine this policy which is failing so dismally in the Americas.

The strategy was defined by Adolf A. Berle, Jr., in 1957 in his book "Tides of Crisis" when he wrote that it was unimportant whether a nation lives under a Socialist or non-Socialist government. What is important is that the nation should not live under a dictatorship. In fact, a rereading of the Berle book will give us a theoretical background of all the misbegotten ideas which President Kennedy apparently has accepted unquestioningly since he stepped into the White House. Once we understand the basic premises on which the strategy is based we can understand why our country has met failure after failure in its Latin American policy, and incidentally in its entire foreign policy. If we would only view the strategy through the eyes of reality rather than through the rose-colored glasses of idealism divorced from reality, we could easily discover the basic fallacy of this strategy. The catch in the whole proposal is that there is no real certainty that the crypto-Communists and the Socialists—the Bosches, the Betancourts, the Ramon Villeda Moraleses, the Haya de la Torreses, the Paz Estenssoros, the Arevalos—are really on our side, that they have actually agreed to play on our team. Do we have any bona fide proof in fact that they are? Their present pretense of friendliness may be only a Dr. Jekyll act of expediency to get U.S. help in their struggle for power. Since they share with the Moscow Communists a common belief in the Marxist picture of the world, why

should we assume that they would not be just as great a menace to the United States as Castro, once they are secure in power?

Indeed, Fidel Castro is himself the prime exhibit of the deadly danger of this Washington attitude. Put into power originally in Cuba with American aid and acclamation, Castro, as late as his visit to Washington in April 1959, described himself as a "liberal" and declared in Washington that "I am going back to Cuba to fight the Communists." Then less than 2 years later on December 2, 1961, he revealed to the world what he really was. If he declared himself divorced from Khrushchev would he be any less Castro? Would the people have any more freedom than they have now? What assurance do Americans have that the present company of our Socialist and crypto-Communist allies in Latin America, whom the State Department is frantically backing, do not entertain the same intentions of a final doublecross?

Perhaps the best example of the dynamite with which we are playing in Latin America is Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. Betancourt was Bosch's No. 1 sponsor in the Dominican Republic. During the days of their exile, Bosch boasts that he was Betancourt's secretary. It is no secret that Bosch consulted Betancourt, after he became President, in many of his major moves. There have been reports in the Dominican Republic that Betancourt financed Bosch's electoral campaign.

Today Betancourt is the beneficiary of one of the most lavish and what I consider one of the most undeserved build-ups in the U.S. press of any Latin American of our times. Just as we heroized Castro in 1958 and 1959, so the liberal American press has pulled out all the stops for Romulo. Even the usually conservative Readers Digest has joined the "amen" chorus and has twice published glowing panegyrics of the Venezuelan President. It was most unfortunate that at the height of the whole buildup, President Kennedy greeted Betancourt at the White House last November with the words:

You are the kind of President the United States wants in Latin America.

For all the evidence indicates that Romulo Betancourt has put over on the American people, one of the most colossal hoaxes ever perpetrated. It is a hoax which he has maintained, in varying forms, for a quarter of a century. For years, despite all his astute efforts to entice the United States to help him to get and hold control of Venezuela, we refused to bite. It has remained for the present administration to fall for him, boots, baggage, and money. Today, not only are we helping him to hold Venezuela, we are also urging him to extend his influence over other strategic points of Latin America. We are accepting him, wide-eyed and open-mouthed, in the face of one of the longest and most subversive Communist records in Latin American history.

One of the minor absurdities of our times is to hear one of our misinformed American liberal friends stand up and

eulogize Betancourt because he is a great democratic leader and the foe of military coup d'etats. Unfortunately, the record shows that Mr. Betancourt is against coup d'etats only when he is not conducting one himself. On October 18, 1945, President Isaias Medina Angarita, who had been elected democratically in the election of 1941, was overthrown by a coup d'etat. Who was the leader of this coup d'etat? You have guessed it. It was Romulo Betancourt. Betancourt was raised by the military to the post of Provisional President. In the crypto-Communist rulebook, the important thing is who pulls off the coup.

To get the real picture of Betancourt it would be revealing to consider his whole career in Venezuela. Betancourt is one of the few men in public life who have ever drawn a diagram of their life plan. This diagram, when we look at it, gives a complete refutation to the touted claim that Betancourt is an anti-Communist.

At this point, a question of semantics faces us. If, by communism, one means the Khrushchev or Castro brand of communism, a very valid case can be made out to prove that Betancourt is against it. But never in his zigzag career has he ever repudiated the basic objective of communism—a socialized society.

Unlike Mao Tse-tung in China, like Enver Hoxha in Albania, but deceptively like Tito in Yugoslavia, Betancourt does not accept Khrushchev's method of reaching the Marxist goal. Right now he is trying, with some success, to communize Latin America, and, by mouthing a few democratic phrases, to hoodwink the United States into helping him do it.

When did he draw his diagram? In 1932 and 1933, Betancourt was an exile in Costa Rica. By this time he had already been a veteran of 6 years of Communist activity. With Machado and Villalba he had set up an underground Communist movement in Venezuela while Gomez was President. He fled to Costa Rica, and, with Manuel Mora, he founded the Communist Party of Costa Rica. He remained a member until 1935.

However, his keen mind began to play around with the idea that communism could best be won in Latin America by detaching itself from Stalin and Moscow. He envisaged a nationalistic form of communism which would assume a different and deceptive shape and name in each country. Already, Haya de la Torre in Peru had been thinking along parallel lines and had launched his Peruvian Aprista movement, after returning from Moscow.

And then Betancourt made the greatest mistake of his careful career. He put his plans down on paper. He sent them in the form of letters to his Communist comrades who were still operating as an underground in Gomez's Venezuela, with their base in Barranquilla, Colombia. One of those who received these letters was Raul Leoni, who is now Betancourt's candidate to succeed him as President of Venezuela in the December 1963 election.

In these letters, he told his little band of disciples that Venezuela could be won for communism if Communists would only be smart enough to stop using the

Communist label. On January 27, 1932, he wrote to Valmore Rodriguez:

We already know how those people fear the aforesaid little word (communism). And with vaseline we may be able to insert into the people all of Marx and all of Lenin, the most vehement hatred of private property, the most intense and active desire to do away with the capitalistic regime without ever having to use this word which smells of sulfur—communism.

In another letter of the same date, he wrote:

In Europe, the peasants and laborers have reached a stage of political intelligence which allows them to act as government functionaries. But in Latin America the peasants and laborers haven't that level of intelligence. Therefore, a Marxist party founded on that basis is doomed. The party to form a high general staff to direct, and that high-level staff should be formed by us because I am confident that we will not allow a deviation until we, with our high intellectuality, will determine the right time has come to make the left turn to the extreme leftwing and ultimately to communism. I derive this from the writings of Lenin who said: "The party shall follow the leader's path." How about it, little brothers? Are you of the same opinion as I?

These letters would never have come to light, and Betancourt's life plans would have remained an undisclosed secret, had it not been for two happenstances. One was the fact that Valmore Rodriguez and Raul Leoni did not destroy the letters. They retained them. And the second accident was that the Columbia police raided the secret Communist headquarters in Barranquilla and found the letters. They turned them over to President Lopez Contreras of Venezuela.

In 1936, President Lopez Contreras published the letters in full, together with a rogue's gallery of photos of Betancourt, Leoni, and Miguel Otero Silva—now a Betancourt senator—in an official Red Book. It is the most damning evidence of the secret Communist plan of Betancourt that has yet been disclosed.

The significance of these Baranquilla letters can be read in the subsequent Betancourt career. A study of his life will show that he has followed almost faithfully the diagram which he drew for his disciples in the early thirties.

Returning to Venezuela after Dictator Gomez's death in 1935, he carried out his "communism without the Communist name" plan by establishing a new party, the ORVE, which was declared illegal by President Lopez Contreras on the grounds that it was actually a Communist Party. Later, after going underground, Betancourt established the Partido Democratico Nacional. This, in turn, was legalized, after a court action in which it was shown that the principal party leaders all were men with open Communist records. With the same elements, Betancourt then launched his Accion Democratica, the party through which he acts today. This party, as we have seen, participated with Perez Jimenez in the coup d'etat which overthrew President Medina in 1945. After 3 years of gross misrule, and communistic government, Betancourt's first administration was overthrown by a second coup d'etat in 1948, the Accion Demo-

cratica was illegalized, and Betancourt went into exile.

However, it was in the forties that Betancourt made his second great political discovery, a discovery which he has coined into the minted gold of fabulous political success. That discovery was that if he would make a pretense of anticommunism and loudly proclaim himself as a democrat, he could obtain the support of virtually the whole body of influential American liberals. They would help him, with their press and radio connections and with their great influence in Washington, particularly in the State Department, to get back into power. Once restored to the Miraflores Palace in Caracas, he could pursue Communist aims while winning American plaudits through his anti-Communist pose. His success in his latest period is attributable almost entirely to this astute strategy.

This basic Betancourt strategy was disclosed in April 1955, in an article published in *Venezuela Democratica*, Betancourt's newspaper in exile, which was issued in Mexico during his stay in that country. The article was a statement of reasons why the *Accion Democratica* would not accept the invitation of the exiled Venezuela Communist Party to go into a united front. It stated that if they took such a course, "We would have to renounce without any compensation, all possibility of aid from the liberal and democratic sectors in the United States, from whom we can expect useful aid." This excerpt appears in the book, "Communism in Latin America," by Prof. R. J. Alexander, himself a Socialist and a staunch supporter of Betancourt. It is a frank revelation of the motivation of the *Accion Democratica* in opposing communism. This motivation is not anticommunism; it is cold-blooded political expediency.

For over a decade, Betancourt has been the recipient of the most fulsome campaign of flattery by American liberals ever enjoyed by a Latin American ruler.

The "liberals" have been his American politics. They have shouted so loudly that they have impressed the Betancourt virtues upon a large sector of the American press, and upon the principal policy-making officials of the Kennedy administration. Today this tarnished and liberal mask-wearing Venezuelan crypto-Communist has become the symbol to millions of uninformed Americans of the kind of leadership which the United States intends to support in the Americas. God help Latin America if such is the future which our Government has planned for them.

But, someone will ask, if it is true that Betancourt is playing a covert false-face game in Venezuela, how does it happen that he is fighting the Castroites and the Communists in Venezuela? Why has he taken recent measures to arrest their leaders?

Here again we are dealing with a situation in which Betancourt is playing with mirrors.

All evidence points to the fact that Betancourt never wanted and never intended actually to suppress the Communists. Castro himself is one of Betan-

court's own disciples. It has been charged that Betancourt intervened with the Colombian authorities to save Castro from death in Bogota in 1948 when he was caught redhanded participating in the bloody Communist uprising—Betancourt was then the head of the Venezuelan delegation to the OAS at the Bogota meeting. It is incredulous to suppose that Betancourt did not know that Castro was a full-fledged Communist at the time. The official leader of the Castro party in Venezuela, the MIR, is Domingo Albert Rangel. Rangel is another of Betancourt's pupils. He grew up in the *Accion Democratica*, and broke with Betancourt only in 1961. Raul Ramos Gimenez, leader of another pro-Castro group, was also one of Betancourt's henchmen in the *Accion Democratica* until 1962.

Even after Castro threw off the mask and revealed himself as a Communist, Betancourt continued to recognize him. Long after the United States had broken off relations with Cuba, Betancourt insisted upon continuing diplomatic relations, breaking them off only after the San Jose conference in August 1960, when he knew he would risk Washington friendship—and aid—if he persisted.

His suppression of the Venezuela Communists has been halfhearted and ineffective. Had he wished to end communism in Venezuela, there was a simple and direct way to do it. He could have outlawed the Communist Party, just as half of the other Latin American countries have done. Betancourt has never resorted to this obvious measure. All along there has been something unmistakably two-handed about his highly publicized reprisals against communism and his failure, in every instance, to follow through. As long ago as October 15, 1962, Betancourt's government announced that it planned to take court action to outlaw the Communist Party and the MIR. More than 1 year later the action has not been taken.

True, he had denied them the right to participate in the rigged December 1963 presidential election, but it is highly significant that when he came to pick his successor for the Presidency he gave the nod, not to a middle-of-the-roader, but to Raul Leoni, his old, and tested comrade of the Communist Party of the thirties.

But it will be asked, if Betancourt is a part of the world Communist conspiracy, why did he finally give the order, late this summer, to arrest Machado and the other top leaders of the official Communist Party? Is this not the sign that he has broken completely with communism?

On the surface, it would seem so. But, like so many other things that happen in the government of a crypto-Communist, the real story is not the one which is carefully fed out to friendly American correspondents to be bold-typed in the U.S. press.

Here is the real story, as given in *El Diario* and *La Prensa*, New York, the principal Spanish language newspaper published in the United States. Here is the story, by Felicino Jaspe, published in the October 30 issue:

It is secretly but well known, among important people (in Venezuela) that Betancourt went on TV to announce action against the Communists only when he was informed by one of his agents within the armed forces that they were coming to take action. The decision of the armed forces resulted from the assassination of two national guardsmen on an excursion train which was going to Les Teques, a town near Caracas. Some Venezuelans quoted the chief of the national guard as saying, "If there is no one to take armed action, I will do it myself." And here is what all Venezuelans are saying: Betancourt is being forced by the military to do things which he does not want to do himself.

How different is this story from the laudatory news stories which appeared in the New York Times and other Betancourt praising papers, picturing the audacious Betancourt cracking down on the party Communists. If he really wanted to weaken the Communists, Betancourt had from February 13, 1959, when he was inaugurated President, until midsummer, 1963, to take the logical action of imprisoning the Machados, Faria, and the other top Communist Party officials. For more than 4 years, he gave the Machados and Faria sanctuary to continue their Communist work in Venezuela, under the alibi that they were members of the Senate, and hence immune to arrest. But when the armed forces laid down the law to him and told him that he must arrest the leaders, Betancourt tremblingly found that he had the power to do so, and he acted. Does this seem like the course which would have been pursued in violence-torn Venezuela by a genuine anti-Communist? Of course, there is only one answer to such a question.

It is admittedly difficult to detect motives when one deals with men like Betancourt. But taking a page from the late Al Smith, let us look at the record. Sometimes what men do speaks so loudly it drowns out what they say. If we would carefully examine the record as a whole, it becomes convincingly clear that Betancourt does not actually want to wipe out communism in Venezuela. Venezuelans who have known Betancourt through all his twists and turns believe that the game he is now playing is to enforce the ascendancy of his *Accion Democratica* brand of communism over the other Communist splinter groups—the Castroites of Rangel and Villalba, and the orthodox Moscow-affiliated Communists of the Machado brothers. If possible, he will keep the rival Communist sects alive for future purposes, but right now he is trying to render them powerless to weaken the Betancourt hegemony.

Betancourt fools American liberals because they cannot understand the labyrinthine intricacies of the trained Communist mind. They fail to see the play within the play. And so, the American public which trusts the advice of the liberals permits itself to be betrayed by its own enthusiasm for the Titos, the Castros, and the Betancourts. The day of revelation, in the case of Betancourt, has not yet come.

One of the incongruities of the Washington atmosphere today is the agonized pain with which our liberal brethren greet each setback to the crypto-Com-

munist forces in Latin America. Every reverse to the Betancourts and the Bosches is greeted as an intolerable blow to the United States. If there is a planning brain in international communism, it could not have planned with more lethal shrewdness. With the false picture of Latin America which the Communists and Socialists have implanted in their minds, nonradical Americans are actually hailing the gravediggers of Americanism as their champions in the Latin American conflict. They are lamenting the fall of the Bosches and the Villeda Moraleses as if it were our loss. Not since the days when half of our State Department was hailing Mao Tse-tung in China as a great "agrarian democrat" have we been so cruelly mistaken.

But the latest development between the Kennedy administration and the Betancourt leftist regime is the information which has recently reached the press that President Kennedy has decided, in the event of a military uprising in Betancourt's Venezuela, to intervene in Betancourt's defense with American troops. The Allen-Scott report says:

President Kennedy has definitely decided on that, and has so informed the State and Defense Departments and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. President Romulo Betancourt also has been told of this momentous decision. . . . In preparation for possible recourse to American troops, the administration has already set the wheels in motion to get Senate backing for such explosive action.

Think of what this means. The United States, which timorously held back from intervention in Castro's Cuba and which argued, even before the Russians fortified the island, that we could not intervene because we were pledged, under the Rio Pact, to take no intervention action without the agreement of two-thirds of the members of the OAS, now contemplates unilateral intervention to save a Betancourt. The United States, which let great China go down the Communist drain, because, as we then argued, we could not intervene to save Chiang Kai-shek without United Nations agreement, is now ready to violate its signed agreements, for what?—to keep crypto-Communist Betancourt in power.

Truly the Kennedy administration, if it attempts such a thing, will have come full circle in its championship of the left in Latin America. If we are willing to repudiate all our commitments under the Rio Pact and the Caracas Declaration for the sole purpose of perpetuating the rule of Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela, then statesmanship has become a plaything in the hands of political immaturity.

When the President of Venezuela came to the United States last February, I was one of a precious few who were willing to speak openly words of warning against all-out support of one who had not proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that he was not a part of the insidious attempt to infiltrate this hemisphere with the Marxist doctrines, so deadly to the health of our civilization.

I felt then we had been sold a bill of goods without having had the opportu-

nity to examine it carefully to see in it the true character of the pattern.

It is understandable that those in policy-making positions in our Government were intent on finding someone, somewhere, upon whom they could pin their hopes as the Messiah of Latin America. The people of the United States do have the interests of the people of all the Americas at heart. We want governments to be stabilized. We would like to stamp out dictatorships and illiteracy and poverty and corruption. We want others to enjoy the stability we have gained in our own great land. A symbol of strength and leadership to the South was needed. Castro's lustre had dimmed and in the exposure of the light he was seen as he is.

"But," I ask, "just why did our State Department hitch its wagon to a star which if not the red of the Soviet Union is certainly not the blue symbolic of loyalty of leadership in the cause of freedom?"

Within the past few months I have had contact with a teacher of science in Venezuela; conversations with a member of an honored profession; a newspaperman who spent nearly 15 years in that area and who knows Betancourt personally; a man who works for an American concern but who is neither Venezuelan or American; and several other Venezuelans who have confided to me that we are making a serious error in our support of the present Government of Venezuela which we trust will take the leadership throughout Latin America.

Following my remarks last February on the eve of Betancourt's state visit, a news reporter who had spent many years in Latin America and who knows the Venezuelan President personally, contacted me by letter. He wrote:

You may not have all the facts but what you have are correct. . . . Romulo never indicated to me he had turned his back on communism.

We are backing a movement in Latin America which claims to be opposed to individual Communists but not to communism. Betancourt has publicly spoken against Castro but his policies are strangely in keeping with Castroism. Let us beware lest we support those whose only mission is to take control of the sprouting movement in the South of this hemisphere, who condemn all, friend and enemy, whom they oppose not because of what they believe and represent but for the position of power they hold which they want for themselves.

It is becoming increasingly evident that our present policy in Latin America is a dismal failure. The time to change this policy in order to rectify our errors in judgment and action is now, not when the situation has so completely deteriorated that violent action on our part would be required.

However, this Venezuelan proposal is a crisis for the future. The curtain raiser for such a course in Venezuela is the present effort of a small group of Senators to stage a dress rehearsal intervention in the Dominican Republic. If we execute such an intervention, and get away with it, a similar step is almost

certain in Venezuela. The irony of the present debate is that the very "liberal" voices, which are now shouting most clamorously for unilateral intervention, include some of the men who protested most passionately against unilateral intervention in Cuba. Until Betancourt and Bosch came into danger, the whole kit and caboodle of this group were violent anti-interventionists. To the liberal mind, consistency is a jewel only when it protects its own ideological friends.

As the issues darken in the Caribbean, it is Juan Bosch himself who has suddenly made the whole liberal effort to save him meaningless and dangerous to American security. The familiar chant of the liberals to justify aid to Bosch and Betancourt is that we need them to lock the gate in their nations against Castroism. Both Bosch and Betancourt have played to the American gallery by declaring their last-ditch opposition to Castro.

But when Bosch was taken from Santo Domingo to the island of Guadalupe on the first leg of his trip into exile, some strange reversal to type caused him to forget the lines which he was supposed to speak. Reaching Guadalupe, he declared, as reported by UPI:

This movement (the Castro movement) is not calling for a struggle to achieve communism, but to achieve liberty.

Later, Bosch tried to shrug this off but his disclaimer is contradicted by the fact that Gonzalo Facio, President of the Council of the OAS sharply rebuked Bosch for his declaration. Facio is himself considered to be a member of the left-liberal group in Latin America.

There is only one conclusion which we can draw from this Bosch lapse into truth-telling. Bosch, as his Dominican opponents have always maintained, has never actually been against Castro. I am convinced that neither is Betancourt, Castro's old mentor. I predict the day will come, to the consternation of the advisers who have been led to assume such unrealistic policies in Latin America, when Betancourt will similarly unmask and tell us what he really wants. But until that moment comes, he will continue, like Tito, like Sukarno, to fatten on our aid and our gullibility.

While the men around Kennedy and Munoz Marin in Puerto Rico are working frantically to bring Bosch back and to reimpose him upon the Dominican people, Bosch himself has drawn a picture of the future which he and his kind are planning for Latin America. Writing in the October 14 issue of the New Leader, a pro-Betancourt weekly, he said:

The peoples of Latin America find themselves on the brink of a revolution. It is a revolution that will once and for all do away with the power of the minority of large landowners, businessmen and the upper-middle class of our hemisphere, and that will dispose of the military cliques which serve them. . . . But I fear that it will be almost impossible to prevent the coming revolution in Latin America from being bloody, destructive and prolonged.

I wonder if President Kennedy with his propensity for the Latin American

left, proposes to underwrite that "bloody, destructive and prolonged revolution."

I wonder if that is the kind of leadership we would like to see throughout all Latin America. I wonder if this is the future our people are paying taxes for through support of the Alliance for Progress.

I have in this speech raised the question of our official all-out acceptance of the good faith of Betancourt and Bosch because the issue has a gravity which far outweighs our natural inclination to trust the judgment of our national policymakers.

We are fighting a cold war for the security of this hemisphere. Only a few years ago, because we refused to face the deadly seriousness of this struggle, we indulged ourselves in the luxury of giving the benefit of the doubt to Fidel Castro. When three former U.S. Ambassadors to Cuba—Mr. Braden, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Gardner—warned the State Department that Castro's liberalism was only a masquerade and that he was actually an agent of the Communist international, the warnings were contemptuously dismissed as rightist claptrap. Then, as now, we were told to join the hallelujah chorus and give Castro all our support.

What was our reward for accepting this ill-advised counsel? We have lived to see Cuba, under our horrified eyes, converted into an armed and bristling Russian base, frowning at us just 90 miles away.

Are we going to make that same mistake again?

The same kind of "gee whiz" minds which accepted and lionized Castro in 1959 are now whooping up a demand for unlimited support for Betancourt in his staged contest with the Castroites. In the face of his 30-year Communist and revolutionary record, we are being asked to accept him as America's Latin American standardbearer against Moscow.

If we fall into this trap, we will be inviting a disaster in Latin America the magnitude of which will dwarf even the catastrophe in Cuba. Can the United States afford to take that risk? Can we unquestioningly accept the word of Mr. Schlesinger, who influences the administration on many things including Latin American affairs, that the bad man of Venezuela's yesterday is now noble and admirable? Just when and where did the switch take place?

Ladies and gentlemen, I insist that we cannot afford to take that gamble. The administration is wrong in Venezuela, just as it was wrong in Peru, in the Dominican Republic, and before that in Cuba. Let us reverse ourselves before we become mired in something which can only lead to further national humiliation and a weakening of the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

In summary, the reasons for my remarks today, and the sole motive behind them, are to promote the good of the United States and at the same time to aid the cause of the peoples of all Latin American countries—the cause of individual freedoms, human dignity, and a better way of life through democratic self-governments of their own choosing.

I recognize this is a complex and monumental challenge in any one country, to say nothing of all those among the Latin American countries where genuine reform is still a crying need and where progress has not yet had even its beginnings. I labor under no delusions that my lone voice will carry very far or that it is powerful enough to be even a little effective. But what I have had to say needed to be said. It needed to be said because I feel that the American people for the most part have been getting only one side of the picture. It has been my objective here to at least let the public know there is another side; to state what in my judgment that other side includes—both from the standpoint of known fact and fair and reasonable conclusion; toward the end that both the people at home and those elected and otherwise chosen to represent and serve them in government may better weigh all factors and have the benefit of all evidence in charting and following the best possible course of action throughout the Americas.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently, on September 17, 1963, it was my privilege to be on a panel at the Los Angeles meeting of the American Mining Congress conducted by the esteemed chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL of Colorado, and to have as a fellow member of the panel the chairman of the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands, the Honorable WALTER BARING, of Nevada.

The wilderness bill, with which I have so long been concerned, was not among my own assigned subjects for that day, but it was the full subject of Mr. BARING's remarks and was introduced by Mr. ASPINALL. What they had to say about wilderness legislation was of keen interest to me at the time and has since influenced me to reconsider some aspects of this important subject in the light of their remarks.

REMARKS BY COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Our chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], introduced the full texts of these addresses into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 3, 1963, where they can be found on pages 17658 and 17659.

Mr. ASPINALL himself made the comment that "we are continually making additional Members of the House of Representatives aware of the basic constitutional question requiring affirmative action by Congress in the designation of wilderness areas."

Mr. BARING assured that—and I quote him:

If there is going to be a wilderness bill, there will be provisions for affirmative action by Congress after the Chief Executive or his Cabinet officers have made their review and submitted their recommendations to Congress.

Mr. BARING indicated that further action regarding the wilderness bill would be dependent on its proponents' being, as Mr. BARING put it, "willing to move in the direction of the compromise offered by the House committee last year."

NEW BILLS PROPOSED TO MEET SUGGESTIONS

During the past weeks I have been pursuing these and other suggestions by the chairman of our committee. With other proponents of the wilderness bill I have been working toward the development of a proposal that might meet the requirements of all concerned and thus merit prompt enactment.

I am today introducing the results of these efforts as a new bill, and am asking unanimous consent that its full text appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION BY CONGRESS

I am happy to assure my colleagues that this revised bill does propose and provide for what our chairman described as "affirmative action by Congress in the designation of wilderness areas."

On June 27, 1963, in a statement to the House—a reprint of which I later sent to each of my colleagues—I sought to indicate a willingness to meet this requirement. On that occasion I said—and I now quote:

Let me emphasize that it is the purpose of advocates of the wilderness bill to see positive action by Congress in establishing a sound national wilderness preservation policy and a program to make this policy effective on the land.

And I said further:

Any proposals that provide for more positive congressional action will have our support if they likewise insure the protection as wilderness of the areas provided for in the act until Congress does take further positive action.

Accordingly, when I found that some redrafting of the wilderness bill had been attempted in the direction, as Mr. BARING put, of the House committee bill last year, I undertook to cooperate by adapting and adopting this myself.

It is this measure that I am today introducing.

SATISFACTION IN PROSPECTS FOR AGREEMENT

Before describing this bill in detail and analyzing its contents, I should like to emphasize briefly the satisfaction with which I anticipate the prospect of agreement on a wilderness bill.

If wilderness is to be preserved in our country, it must be by the firm determination of all who are concerned.

The urgency for the preservation of some of our remaining areas of wilderness has come from all parts of the Nation. It has been nonpartisan. In enacting a measure to establish wilderness preservation as a national policy, we must accordingly be nonpartisan and nationwide in our view.

It is especially important that those whose enterprises might destroy the wilderness be among the supporters of its preservation. They can see that the needs for which wilderness might be sacrificed are met outside the wilderness. They can provide the consensus on which the preservation of wilderness in our culture must be based if it is to endure.

I would indeed be happy to see differences regarding the wilderness bill resolved and to see a prospect for its enactment with a broad basis of nonpartisan national support.

NEW BILL ONE ON WHICH WE CAN AGREE

The bill I now introduce, I am convinced, is one on which we can all agree. The committee may find ways to improve it, and I shall be glad to cooperate in its further consideration, but essentially, I am satisfied; it meets the criticisms made against its predecessors and meets these in a way to merit its support.

It is described as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The revised wilderness bill (H.R. 9070) proposes to exercise congressional prerogatives with regard to Federal lands—pursuant to the Constitution's article IV, section 3, 2d paragraph—by taking positive action to first establish a national congressional policy for the preservation of some Federal areas as wilderness; second, provide a program for carrying out this policy through the administration of existing wilderness within the national park system, within wildlife refuges and ranges, and within certain designated portions of the national forests, by the presently established agencies; and do this in such a way as to preserve the wilderness character of the lands without interfering with their present purposes and without transferring any lands from one jurisdiction to another; and, third, make provisions to prevent the wilderness preservation program from interfering with other programs and to provide for emergency and other exceptions.

These objectives the wilderness bill would achieve through, first, the declaration of a national policy; second, the designation by Congress of wilderness areas; third, the provision of guidelines for the use and administration of the areas involved; and fourth, certain other provisions related to gifts, bequests, contributions, inholdings, records, and reports.

The measure requires no expenditures beyond those that would be called for in any case in administering the park, refuge, or forest lands for their presently established purposes.

The bill's provisions are more fully yet briefly described as follows:

First. A national policy "to secure the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness" by establishing wilderness areas, is set forth in section 2, which likewise includes a definition of wilderness.

Second. The areas designated or to be considered for designation as wilderness areas are specified, and procedures for determining the areas to be considered are set up. Any lands not provided for in this act are to be added only by a subsequent act of Congress.

Third. Guidelines for the use and administration of the wilderness areas are set forth in section 4, which says that nothing in the act shall interfere with the purposes the areas serve as park, refuge, or forest land but that these purposes shall be served in such a way as to preserve the wilderness character of the lands designated as wilderness. Section

4 also prohibits certain uses inconsistent with wilderness preservation and makes special provisions or exceptions regarding certain nonconforming uses. The President is authorized to allow certain otherwise prohibited uses in specific areas of wilderness if he finds these uses "will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof."

Fourth. Certain other provisions regarding State and private lands within wilderness areas, gifts or bequests of land, records and reports, and contributions are in sections 5, 6, and 7.

EXPLANATION, SECTION BY SECTION

An explanation of the measure, section by section, is as follows:

Section 1 states the title as the "Wilderness Act."

Section 2 is a statement of policy, including a definition.

Section 2(a) is a statement of Congress belief that increasing population and human developments will occupy or modify all areas of the Nation except those set aside for preservation in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of Congress to assure the Nation an enduring resource of wilderness, and for this purpose a National Wilderness Preservation System is established to be composed of appropriate federally owned areas.

Section 2(b) defines wilderness in three sentences. The first States the nature of wilderness in an ideal concept of areas where the natural community of life is untrammelled by man, who visits but does not remain. The second sentence describes an area of wilderness as it is to be considered for the purposes of the act—areas where man's works are substantially unnoticeable, where there is outstanding opportunity for solitude or a primitive or unconfined type of recreation, and where there may also be ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical values—areas including at least 5,000 acres and of sufficient size to make their preservation as wilderness practicable. The third sentence says that for the purposes of this act wilderness shall include the areas provided for in its section 2.

Section 3 sets out the areas of Federal lands in national forests, in the park system, and in wildlife refuges and game ranges which—subject to existing private rights—are designated as wilderness areas or are to be considered for such designation. A procedure is established that will assure review of every area by the executive agency in charge of it prior to its designation by the Congress. Addition of areas not specified in the act is limited to those established by later action by Congress.

NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Section 3(a) designates as wilderness areas the presently existing wilderness, wild, and canoe areas of the national forest, and sets forth requirements that maps and descriptions of the areas and regulations regarding them be available to the public.

Subsections 3(a) and (b) both deal with national forest areas now administratively classified for wilderness protection. There are 86 of these areas, totaling some 14,731,471 acres (out of the national forest total of 186 million acres).

The 17 wilderness and 32 wild areas and the 1 canoe area have already been carefully reviewed by the Forest Service for classification as such and were classified after having been subjected to public-notice and public-hearing procedures. Section 3(a) accordingly designates these as wilderness areas without further review and sets forth requirements for maps and descriptions of them and for having maps, descriptions, and copies of notices and reports available to the public. These areas immediately designated total 8,609,659 acres—wilderness areas 6,409,284, wild 1,165,523, and canoe 1,034,852.

Section 3(b) deals with the 3 dozen now existing primitive areas in the national forests, the 36 areas comprising in all 6,121,812 acres. These areas are made subject to further review, half to be completed in 3 years and all within 5 years. After the reviews by the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture is to report the findings to the President and the President is to make recommendations regarding each area to the Senate and the House. These recommendations may include a proposed elimination and declassification of portions not found to be predominantly of wilderness value or proposed addition of contiguous areas of national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value.

Each such recommendation will become effective only if so provided by an act of Congress. The primitive areas are to continue in their status quo until Congress has acted on a presidential recommendation or has determined otherwise.

There are other national forest areas that are in fact wilderness but have never been so classified for protection as such. Nothing in this bill would prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from considering such areas for preservation. Each area, however, will have to be the subject of further legislation in the future. The bill provides that—and I quote:

No Federal lands shall be designated as "wilderness areas" except as provided for in this Act or by a subsequent Act.

Section 3(c) makes a provision for wilderness within national park system areas and national wildlife refuges and ranges that is like that made with regard to primitive areas.

The Secretary of the Interior in this instance is to review the roadless portions comprising 5,000 or more acres in the parks and refuges and report his recommendations to the President.

The President is to advise the House and the Senate of his recommendations.

An area will be given wilderness protection on a permanent basis only if and when Congress so provides. The areas are to be administered in status quo until Congress has acted on a Presidential rec-

Through resolutions adopted by our Miami Beach national convention in September, the American Legion has pledged its support and that of its members to assist the law enforcement agencies of the land whenever and wherever they can be of help.

Basically, I believe the American people to be patriotic, law-abiding citizens. Yet, as sometimes happens in our zeal to protect our homes and families from the elements of lawlessness, there is ever the tendency to take the law into our own hands.

This is not the type of help I mean when I invite you to call upon Legionnaires to assist you.

When I say use them, I mean in the capacity that you would seek the assistance of any good citizen who can be of help to you in your work. The American Legion is not, and does not propose to become an investigative body. This is the work of the trained, professional officer, which is as it should be, and as the American Legion views it.

I have mentioned the fact that the American Legion believes extremism to be undesirable, yet in the very field in which you men labor there appears to be extremes of opinion as to how we may best cope with the problems of lawlessness.

These range from the apparent trend in some communities to be over sympathetic to the cause of the criminal, to the opinion expressed in some circles that the FBI should be converted into a national police force, or that a new agency be created as a national police force.

Again, may I say I believe it would be a mistake to go overboard in either direction. As a practicing attorney, I believe the punishment should fit the crime, and that justice should be administered fairly and impartially.

I believe that justice should be administered with logic and with reason, and taking note of the alarming increase in major crimes committed by youngsters under the age of 18, I believe there is a pressing need for more effective programs of rehabilitation of youngsters who have gone astray.

To be sure, there are the incorrigibles among the younger criminal element. On the other hand, there are those who made a mistake and who, with proper guidance, could become useful members of society. I do not propose to excuse a criminal act because of the age of the offender. I do say that every effort should be made to save that which is salvageable.

As a citizen, I concur with Director Hoover's view that a national police force is neither necessary nor desirable. I believe that such an agency could conceivably constitute a dangerous encroachment by the Federal Government.

The responsibility for proper law enforcement is primarily that of local agencies and of local citizens, and there the responsibility should remain. The FBI certainly has proved its capabilities for enforcing those Federal laws which fall within its jurisdiction, and the cooperative effort they provide to local and State enforcement agencies leads me to believe we already have the machinery to do the job.

You men of this graduating class from the FBI National Academy have a rare opportunity and a significant challenge facing you as you return to your respective departments across this land in foreign countries. Yours is the opportunity to help raise the standards of performance of your fellow officers by imparting to them the knowledge you have gained here. Yours is the challenge of insuring that law and order shall prevail in your respective communities.

On behalf of the American Legion I wish you Godspeed in the vital mission you are about to assume.

ADDRESS OF MR. ROBERT E. FRUSHER,
OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY PATROL

Mr. Hoover, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Foley, Mr. Clark, Dr. Elson, distinguished guests, fellow classmates, ladies and gentlemen, "It has been said that a man who works with his hands is a laborer, a man who works with his hands and his head is a craftsman, a man who works with his hands, his head and his heart is an artist."

This was a quote which one of our classmates came across during the extensive research which we performed in the last 12 weeks. It is, I think, quite appropriate for this occasion.

Some of us arrived here as laborers, others as craftsmen. Perhaps a few even approached the status of artist. But none had the knowledge and training necessary to be fully competent as laborer, craftsman or artist in the law enforcement profession. This was one of the first lessons we learned. So we renewed our determination to gain as much knowledge as possible during the 3 months ahead of us.

With graduation, we are beginning to realize and appreciate what these 3 months have meant to us. We have learned that hands and head are not enough to make us truly professional law enforcement officers—we must put our hearts into our work also. We realize we are just beginning to learn about our chosen profession. To conclude that we are now totally enlightened with respect to law enforcement would be a betrayal of Mr. Hoover and all the people connected with the FBI National Academy. We have learned much, but the most important lesson taught us is that we must continue to study and work to advance ourselves and our profession.

I take great pleasure and pride in serving as the spokesman for this class to thank you, Mr. Hoover, for having had the foresight to create this Academy to benefit all law enforcement officers. Its excellent influence on law enforcement has been tremendous and is growing steadily. I doubt that there is an officer in the United States who has not heard about the FBI National Academy. Many of them hope, as we did, to attend it. A number of us have been closely associated with officers who previously attended the Academy and have benefited from the knowledge they obtained here. But not until we became a part of the fellowship we have enjoyed in and out of class and spent the many long nights together in study did we fully appreciate the meaning of this Academy.

This is one of the largest classes ever to be graduated. We have had the privilege and honor of having 18 officers from 13 foreign countries in this class. It has been encouraging to learn that our fellow officers from other parts of the world are dedicated to the same principles we hold, and that they are striving as we are to improve their status and stature through proper training. We enjoyed working with these men and feel we have established new and valued friendships which will help advance the cause of good law enforcement around the world. We also are proud of the members of our class who shot perfect scores on the practical pistol course.

We are deeply indebted to the special agent counselors, to each member of the Academy training staff, to the visiting lecturers and to all other members of the FBI who have given of their time, knowledge, and years of experience to make this Academy a success.

We cannot forget the ones who were left behind during our stay in Washington—our wives and children. Without their love and faith, it would not have been possible to attend or complete this course.

We assure you, Mr. Hoover, and the administrators of our departments, that we will

share our knowledge with other officers and will strive to make law enforcement a better profession for ourselves and those who follow. We return home knowing that the knowledge obtained here will enable us to better use our hands, our heads, and our hearts, and to teach others to do the same so that we all may become artists in our profession.

SUBVERSION, NOT SUGAR, CUBA'S TOP EXPORT

(Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. Tuten) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, we observed last month the first anniversary of a crisis which brought the world to the threshold of nuclear disaster. A year ago, our people recognized that the risk in Cuba was great, but so were the stakes.

Our action was hailed by our friends, and our firm resolve at a time of supreme crisis gained for us new confidence from our hemispheric neighbors. The initiative we gained last fall in this area has since slipped from our grasp. Fidel Castro and his Kremlin-supported government remain the unfinished business of the hemisphere. Today we are again on the defensive in Latin America, where gnawing Castro-Communist subversive activities are increasing.

Hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs earlier this year indicated the scope of Communist subversive activities emanating from Cuba. A recent three-part newspaper article by Mr. Charles Keely of the Copley News Service not only substantiates the findings of the subcommittee but reveals that Communist subversion in the Latin American area is being stepped up. Mr. Keely's articles follow:

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Charles Keely)

(First of three articles)

WASHINGTON.—A year ago Russia took one step backward and withdrew missiles from Cuba. Since then, the Communists have taken a dozen important steps forward toward their goal of a Red takeover of Latin America.

The steps are documented. They reveal that Premier Fidel Castro's Cuba is a launching pad for subversion of the Western Hemisphere.

Today, 10 schools of guerrilla warfare and subversion are operating at full capacity in Cuba. Last year, according to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone, 1,500 Latin Americans received such training in Cuba. More schools are being built.

Intelligence sources estimate 20,000 secret Red agents can be trained this year in Cuba's subversion centers.

In essence, McCone told Congress last February, "Castro tells revolutionaries * * * 'Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage and in terrorism. We will see that you get back to your homeland.'"

Travel bans have not hurt Cuba's subversion school attendance, an Organization of American States security committee reports.

"Despite limited means of transportation to Cuba today," the OAS said, "Trips to that country have been increasing in number during the current year."

was subjected to the most vitriolic criticism of many of our supposedly leading newspapers. Yet, fearlessly, he went forward and carried through to success the necessary legislation that would enable the Government of the United States to curtail and to combat such forces. He likewise has aligned himself very forcefully with the legislation being sought by the various Attorneys General over the recent years to combat the underworld activities and, particularly now, the activities of the Cosa Nostra. A man like him is seldom found to have reached so many years and to have accomplished so much and we are indeed privileged to you, Mr. Speaker, this morning for having you with us.

ADDRESS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

It is with great pride and pleasure that I come before you on this occasion which I know is a most significant event in the lives of you officers who are graduating from this 72d session of the FBI National Academy.

While none can foretell the total impact that these past 12 weeks of intensive training may have upon your lives and careers, it is safe to assume that each of you will have benefited substantially from the training you have received here.

I am confident also, that your respective departments, your fellow officers, and your communities will reap abundant rewards for your having been here. There is no other place in America where you may acquire the professional skills taught here, and I'm sure there is no place where you will find a staff of more experienced and expert instructors in the various phases of law enforcement.

You may take justifiable pride in the fact you were selected to attend this Academy for you were selected on the recommendation of your superiors, and with the endorsement of Director J. Edgar Hoover under whose leadership this Academy was conceived and developed to its present high state of efficiency.

Naturally, the training in law enforcement work will be the greatest single asset you will carry with you from the FBI Academy. There are, however, certain intangibles associated with this experience that will serve you well in the years ahead.

Important among these intangibles is the comradeship established as you worked and studied with men from 37 States and 13 foreign countries—men whose chosen profession and ultimate objectives are the same as yours.

You have cultivated friendships and developed an understanding of personalities and backgrounds entirely different from those which you encounter in your daily work at home. Your associations here have provided you with an understanding and appreciation of problems peculiar to certain areas, and the realization that many problems are universal. I would urge you to maintain the friendships and understanding which have developed here, for they are priceless. It was precisely this type of relationship, developed during wartime military service to our Nation, which led to the founding of the American Legion.

Another, and equally important intangible is the esprit de corps which you must feel. None can be closely associated with the FBI without being inspired by the spirit of this organization. Mr. Hoover's personal dedication to law and order has been instilled in every member of the FBI and, as a result, this great organization has been lifted above the norm and into the realm of excellence.

No organization can hope to achieve greatness without members with spirit who take pride in their group, its work, and its objectives. Thankfully, the same 2½ million members of the American Legion are imbued with this same spirit and pride in the work which they seek to accomplish.

The American Legion is comprised of men and women from all walks of life, of widely

diversified backgrounds and interests. They have a common goal, however. Each is dedicated to keeping this great Nation strong and free.

All Legionnaires are personally aware of the rigors of wartime service. Many of our members carry visible reminders of the armed conflicts which America has been forced to fight. Yet, those of us who remain share a common and sacred trust to perpetuate the high cause of freedom which so many fought and died to preserve.

When a small group of veterans of the American Expeditionary Force met in Paris, France, in 1919, to form what is now the American Legion, they immediately defined the principles and purposes for which this great organization would stand through the years, and which included:

1. The creation of a fraternity based on a firm comradeship born of wartime service, and dedicated to the cause of equal treatment for all veterans, particularly the disabled, their widows, and orphans.

2. A system of national defense for America, including a program of universal military training which would keep this Nation strong and serve as a deterrent to future would-be aggressors.

3. The promotion of patriotism and the combating of materialistic and totalitarian ideologies which recognize neither the honor nor the dignity of man.

Justice for the disabled was, is, and shall always be a major goal of the American Legion. The achievements of the Legion in this area of concern is a matter of record and of history, but the effort continues.

From the Legion's concern for the children of disabled and deceased veterans was born the American Legion child welfare program, which long since has expanded its scope of activity so that it now operates under the slogan of "A Square Deal for Every Child." Since 1925, the Legion and its affiliated organizations have contributed more than \$185 million to this cause, ranging from direct financial assistance to the children of needy veterans to major contributions for research into crippling diseases and vexing problems affecting America's youth.

The success of this program through the years may be traced to an alertness to changing concepts of child care and guidance dictated by rapidly changing social conditions. New areas of concern for our child welfare program include support for more rigid Federal and State controls over the illicit drug traffic which is a growing menace to our young people. We also seek laws that would require reporting to the proper authorities of cases of physical abuse of children by adults, similar to laws now requiring the reporting of gunshot wounds.

The American Legion's intense interest in national security is a natural area of concern for our organization. We have asked, and we continue to ask that our Nation maintain defensive forces, both in men and material, superior to those of any potential enemy. We ask that these forces be maintained in the hope that they need never be employed—but we of the Legion believe that preparedness is the key to the maintenance of freedom, and we believe that our best defense is a military potential unmatched throughout the world, and strongly backed by the patriotic and moral resources of a freedom-loving citizenry.

We believe our Nation should always be prepared to speak from a position of strength to those who understand no other language. The validity of our position has been painfully proved. After World War I our Nation's military strength was dissipated. We were gravely unprepared to defend ourselves as was shown so forcefully at the time of the attack upon Pearl Harbor.

Again in Korea America's citizen soldiers responded, and acquitted themselves nobly—

but were we really ready? America finally adopted a form of universal military training—a program long advocated by the American Legion—and that program was strengthened with the enactment in 1955 of the national security training law. We shall continue to speak up on behalf of adequate and modern weapons and well-trained men as a deterrent to aggression.

The greatest military machine in the world cannot prevail if America is permitted to decay from within. Crime and delinquency have an adverse influence upon our communities, and must be eliminated. Furthermore, there are powerful influences at work in America today intent upon destroying our moral strength and our dedication to the principles of freedom. I speak of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and its various front groups.

The Legion, is and always has been, a determined foe of communism. While the struggle with communism has cost many lives in Korea, in Vietnam, and in other troubled areas of the world, the struggle here at home has been bloodless but no less treacherous.

Members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., have used every conceivable trick and device in the effort to influence Americans toward their viewpoint, and strive constantly to dull Americans' sense of appreciation for the freedoms they enjoy and to weaken their will to fight to preserve them.

Almost daily we read or hear of Communist efforts to infiltrate our Government and steal our defense secrets. The Communists are bent on imposing their will upon us, and we must be as dedicated in our efforts to resist the encroachments of communism as they are to foster their false ideologies.

If our freedoms fall, that of the remainder of the free world will fall with us for this Nation is the last major barrier to the Red goal of world conquest.

It is our contention, and again history has proved the accuracy of our stand, that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left, is the course of failure. To follow such a course has brought about the downfall of many men, of many governments, yes, even of entire civilizations.

It is the view of the Legion that a strong program of positive Americanism, strengthening our basic belief in our principles and ideals, is the best answer to atheistic communism. Through Legion-sponsored Americanism programs, more than three-quarters of a million American youngsters each year are exposed to activities designed to give them a greater appreciation of our form of government and our way of life.

Our Boys State and Boys Nation programs teach better citizenship to more than 27,000 boys each year. More than 122,000 youngsters each year learn the elements of citizenship and self-sufficiency through Legion-sponsored Boy Scout units. Some 355,000 high school students annually learn the meaning of our Constitution and Bill of Rights through preparation for the Legion's national high school oratorical contest, and a quarter of a million youngsters learn the rules of the game of life while playing American Legion baseball each year.

Through these programs we hope to help our young people grow to responsible adult citizenship—to develop strong minds in sound bodies, and to stem the tide of delinquency which produces all too many potential criminals.

The scope of organized crime in these United States has been made alarmingly clear to Americans in recent weeks, and Mr. Hoover has wisely warned that law enforcement cannot achieve total victory over the elements of lawfulness without the cooperation and assistance of the honest citizens of each community, individually and collectively.

Many of the students reach Cuba by slipping across the British Honduran border into Mexico, the Cuban Student Directorate (DRE) has revealed. From islands off the Yucatan Peninsula, they are taken in small boats to a sea rendezvous with Castro's "fishing fleet."

The Latins are then taken to the port of La Coloma, in Cuba's Pinar del Rio Province, and transported to the different training camps. Others fly or sail into Cuba from Communist countries.

Castro's clumsy and unsuccessful efforts to invade and subvert neighboring Caribbean countries during his first 9 months in power have been given professional guidance by trained "technicians" from the Soviet bloc.

The State Department's Sterling Cottrell says that Reds from satellite nations today outnumber Russians in Cuba. Cottrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, told Congress August 13 that "Czechs, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and others" are in Cuba to train Latin Americans in the arts of modern guerrilla warfare and subversion. The threat to the United States of Soviet troops in Cuba is secondary to the use of the island as a base to export revolution, said Cottrell.

"Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly," CIA's McCone explained. "In its professional tradecraft it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc including veteran Spanish Communists."

One Spanish Communist, Gen. Alberto Bayo, created the "Revolutionary Commandos for Latin America" (CRAL) to train Latins to instigate insurrections against their governments. To strengthen CRAL, DRE claims, Soviet Col. Jarslav Valensky instituted an International Military Command to control the widespread net of Communist front groups in Latin America.

A "supreme command" for Latin American guerrillas has been set up in Cuba by the Soviet Ministry of Defense, according to exile intelligence sources. Its headquarters are in Santiago de Cuba where guerrilla operations throughout the hemisphere are masterminded and coordinated.

Enrique Lister, another Spaniard, runs the Minas del Frio subversion school in Oriente Province. Lister, a graduate of the Soviet's Frunze Military Academy, is assisted by former Guatemalan President Col. Jacobo Arbenz.

At the Julio Antonio Mella School near Havana, Communists are training Latin labor leaders. Military personnel receive instruction at the El Cortijo School in Pinar del Rio, the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba reports. The San Lorenzo School in Oriente specializes in guerrilla training. Subversion centers are spread across the island.

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Charles Keely)

(Second of three articles)

WASHINGTON.—Cuban Maj. Maximo Canales left San Julian Air Base in Cuba with five Venezuelan terrorists trained in Premier Fidel Castro's guerrilla warfare schools, and flew over the San Andres Islands off the coast of Panama.

The men parachuted into the water and were picked up by a small fishing boat which took them to Maracaibo, Venezuela. Later they joined a guerrilla force of the pro-Castro FALN organization to wage war against President Romulo Betancourt.

Subversion has replaced sugar as Cuba's top export.

Many of the thousands of Latin Americans receiving training in Cuba today are being parachuted back into their homelands. Others return to Mexico in "shrimp boats," and then go home.

According to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone, Fidel Castro tells these trained subversives, "We will keep in touch with you, give you propaganda support, send you propaganda materials * * * secret communications methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

Venezuela, says McCone, is Castro's "No. 1" target and FALN's sabotage "is the work of experts (using) advanced types of explosives."

McCone told Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN's, Democrat, of Alabama, Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America that more than 200 Venezuelans received training in Cuba in 1962. He said the number is increasing this year.

The 1,600 Latin Americans who were trained in Cuba last year, according to McCone, took courses ranging from 4 weeks to a year.

They include "intensive training in sabotage, espionage, or psychological warfare."

No country in the Western Hemisphere is immune to the cancer of Castro-inspired terrorism. On November 17, 1962, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in New York City smashed a Castro-Communist plot to launch a series of terrorist attacks on department stores. The FBI reported that members of Cuba's United Nations delegation were training "a corps of Cuban Communists in the use of explosives."

The United States and its Latin neighbors have met the Communist challenge with limited success.

The Selden subcommittee recommended to President Kennedy that the United States "should be prepared to act with military force" to help any nation in danger of being overthrown by Communist subversive aggression.

The Organization of American States (OAS) has passed numerous resolutions dealing with means to counter the Castro offensive.

Yet, day by day the Cuban-trained terrorists nibble away at this false front of anti-Castro hemispheric unity.

"These wolves in sheep's clothing are the greatest danger ever to threaten the country," explained Colombian President Guillermo Leon Valencia on September 25.

On October 2 Radio Havana warned the Nicaraguan Government "to take care." Broadcasting from Cuba, a woman identified as Blanca Sandino, daughter of the late Nicaraguan rebel bandit, regularly incites Nicaraguans to rebel and join pro-Castro guerrillas whom she says already are operating in the country.

The Cuban Student Directorate in Exile claims that 100 instructors, trained in Cuba, have organized a Colombian guerrilla force of more than 1,600, broken into 13 groups in 5 territorial areas.

Tony Varona, former Cuban foreign minister and leader of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, told Congress that the international Communist movement is enlisting volunteers in all 19 Latin countries. The objective, he said, is to build a people's army of 400,000 men, 100,000 women, and 200,000 reserves to defend Cuba in the event of aggression.

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Charles Keely)

(Last of three articles)

WASHINGTON.—On September 12, Cuban-trained Colombian rebels kidnaped wealthy Cattleman German Mejia Duque and held him for \$250,000 ransom.

During the 6 days he spent in the insurgents' camp before his rescue by army troops, Mejia said a Cuban plane flew over the area and dropped weapons, propaganda and other material to Premier Fidel Castro's look-alike guerrilla leader Federico Arango Fonnegra.

The bearded Arango told Mejia that Castro recently had sent him \$20,000 with a warn-

ing that this would be the last financial support he would get if his terrorists did not accomplish a decisive operation against the Government.

Colombian Interior Minister Aurelio Camacho Rueda said Castro is openly intervening in Colombia by "sending arms and money from Cuba to the bandits and the offering of scholarships to Colombian students to study guerrilla warfare and terrorist techniques in Havana."

Twelve tons of Communist propaganda is discovered monthly by Panama's customs authorities, according to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone. Another 10 tons comes into Costa Rica.

"Castro is strengthening his position" in the wake of last October's missile crisis, says Costa Rican President Francisco Orlich.

"I expect continuous, increased attempts at agitation here."

Former Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes charged last February that since late 1959 Russian submarines have been reaching the Central American Pacific and Atlantic coasts to unload men and arms.

Cuba has clearly become an open floodgate for a torrent of terrorists. They flood a politically parched Latin America, sowing seeds of subversion.

When Castro can't finance them, they turn to other sources of income.

Peruvian guerrillas, teamed with "ordinary criminals," robbed a Lima bank last year of \$100,000 and split the loot 50-50, McCone told a congressional subcommittee several months ago.

Venezuelan pro-Castro terrorists robbed a bank last February of \$25,000.

"The principle that guerrillas must be self-sustaining his obviously been applied to finances," McCone explained.

But he added that there are also involved bank transfers by which Cuban money eventually reaches Latin American Communist-front groups.

One such example was outlined here several weeks ago by British Guianese Sen. Anne Jardim, who revealed documents showing the transfer of \$1 million from Russia through Cuba to Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan, the Communists' best friend in South America.

Castro sounded the keynote for Cuban subversion on July 26, 1960.

"We promise to continue making Cuba the example that can convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the American continent," he said.

He has restated this goal on countless occasions, with the full blessing of Moscow and Peiping.

Intelligence sources say Castro's subversive pipeline to Latin America today is his growing "fishing fleet."

With the help of the Japanese, Castro has built an estimated 169 fishing vessels, though Hurricane Flora reportedly sunk 39. These vessels carry their subversive cargoes between Cuba and Latin America.

An Organization of American States (OAS) security committee has reported that this Communist advance in the Western Hemisphere is due mainly to the lack of information regarding its true aims.

Col. Jose Luis Cruz Salazar, Guatemalan politician and soldier, told Congress February 27 that the Communist menace is not speculation.

"It is a reality, and we must open our eyes to it," he said.

THE CASE AGAINST JESSICA MITFORD, HER SUPPORTERS AND ADMIRERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. A few weeks ago I inserted some remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with reference to Jessica Mitford—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 15, 1963, page A6429. These remarks brought forth a hail of condemnation from the lethal left which quickly sprang to her defense with all kinds of maudlin apologies. I was not surprised to see the editorial in the New York Times of October 21, 1963, which indicated that no one without congressional immunity would dare make such a statement. The statements which I made have been published in many periodicals which do not have congressional immunity, so that dodge is pure hogwash.

In assessing the New York Times, it should be remembered that it was most laudatory in its praises of Communist Castro, and one of its reporters, Herbert Matthews, was most instrumental in working with our State Department envoys in establishing the Communist Castro government, and even last week Castro praised Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, who is now visiting Cuba with his wife. I am wondering how Matthews got his passport validated to visit Cuba, while the State Department has been refusing permission to students to visit Cuba.

It was not my purpose then, nor is it now, to defend the abuses which undoubtedly exist in the funeral business. These same abuses can be charged to many American businesses. In fact, every time I buy a new automobile I am persuaded to include some extras which are very nice, but not absolutely necessary. Some of these extras cost more than the average funeral, but I did not have to buy them. My real purpose for my original remarks was that I felt that when CBS in its so-called documentary, "The Great American Funeral," was going to bring an identified Communist into several million American homes, the public was entitled to know the identity of the author in order to evaluate the subject matter. Surely, if I wrote a book on the theory of relativity, the public would be entitled to know that I am neither a physicist nor a mathematician, and that slight credence should be given to me in this field.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should mention that the rumor was broadcast throughout the Nation that I or my family owned an interest in the Fair Haven Cemetery at Santa Ana, Calif. I wish to emphatically state that neither I nor any of my family now has nor ever had any financial interest in any cemetery whatsoever. I assume this rumor started because I was a trustee of Orange County Cemetery District No. 1, a public, municipal, tax-supported district, organized to take over and restore two abandoned cemeteries in which hundreds of California pioneers were buried. I was a trustee, appointed by the Orange County Board of Supervisors, over a period of 20 years, and served without salary or expenses.

The apologists for Jessica Mitford, also known as Decca Treuhaft, continue to remind the public that she wrote a "smashing hit," even though she makes the ex-

ception appear to be the rule. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that there was another author who wrote a smashing hit. His name was Karl Marx, whose works today rank second only to the Bible in annual sales. The burden of his book was an attack on the capitalistic free enterprise system and on religion, but today no one but Communists and Socialists rise to his defense. The burden of "The American Way of Death" is likewise a two-pronged attack: First, against the free enterprise capitalistic system enjoyed by Americans; second, against the funeral service which is basically a religious service, for those who have an immutable belief in the immortality of the soul.

As Rev. Dr. Edgar N. Jackson, a Methodist minister, of Mamaroneck, N.Y., said:

A funeral faces the reality of death. It does not avoid it.

A funeral provides a setting wherein the religious needs of the bereaved may be satisfied.

A funeral provides faith to sustain spirit.

A funeral helps free one from guilt or self-condemnation.

A funeral helps express one's feelings.

A funeral directs one beyond the death of a loved one to the responsibilities of life.

A funeral, in a personal way, helps one face a crisis with dignity and courage.

A funeral above all provides an environment where loving friends and relatives can give the help needed to face the future with strength and courage.

The above-referred-to editorial in the New York Times indicated that Jessica Mitford's association with Communist activities was in the dim and distant past. Let us look at the record. Jessica Mitford, also known as Decca Treuhaft, was identified as a member of the Communist Party in hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, as follows:

By Dickson P. Hill, an undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during his membership in the Communist Party (1944-49), "Investigation of Communist Activities in the San Francisco Area, part 2," December 2, 1953, page 3227.

By Dr. Jack (Beverly Mikell) Patten, a former member of the Communist Party (1936-40 and 1946-48), "Hearings Held in San Francisco, Calif., June 18-21, 1957, part 1," June 10, 1957, page 1188.

By Dorothy M. Jeffers, an undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during her membership in the Communist Party (1943-52), "Hearings Held in San Francisco, Calif., June 18-21, 1957, part II," June 21, 1957, page 1295.

Her stint before the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities was related in my previous remarks, and appears on pages 260-262 of that committee's report to the 1953 regular California Legislature.

We are told that leading clergymen of all faiths endorse the so-called exposé. That may be true, but do not forget that many of our leaders of all faiths are collectivists and most of them oppose the House Committee on Un-American Activities, so they are running true to form.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that one of these leaders who appeared on the CBS program, "The Great American Funeral," Rev. Stephen Fritchman, has been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities for his Communist-

front affiliations and, of course, he took the fifth amendment. Again, I say, "strange bedfellows." Reverend Fritchman was also a contributor to the Communist People's World of September 7, 1963.

The commercial sponsor for the CBS colossal, "The Great American Funeral," was the Travelers' Insurance Co. of America, which is engaged in selling insurance for all contingencies, including death. It must have grated the Travelers' agents to watch the door-to-door salesmen castigated. There is no business in America that engages more heavily in telephone solicitation and door-to-door selling than do the various insurance companies of America. If the capitalistic free enterprise system is destroyed in America, its demise is being gratuitously aided by the American business community which sponsors such programs.

It might be well, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to examine another book of Jessica Mitford, "Daughters and Rebels," which is an autobiography, in which she refers to her father, who was an outstanding British citizen, as the missing link between ape and homo sapiens. She also admits that she was a shoplifter, a "bill jumper," and that she bought volumes of Communist literature and "rigged up some homemade hammer and sickle flags." This book was written in 1960. As late as 1963, she was invited to be a special guest at the 25th anniversary celebration of the Communist People's World in San Francisco. This is according to People's World—the January 19, 1963, issue. Whether she attended or not, I do not know.

In her book, "Daughters and Rebels," on page 12 in referring to her governesses, she says:

She was soon followed by Miss Bunting, whose main contribution to our education was to teach a little mild shoplifting * * * Miss Bunting in her governessy beige coat and gloves, Boud (Jessica's sister) and I in matching panama straw hats, would strut haughtily past the deferential salespeople to seek the safety of Fuller's Tea Room, where we would gleefully take stock of the day's haul over cups of steaming hot chocolate.

In referring to her father on page 29, she writes:

I developed the theory that he was a throwback to an earlier state of mankind, a missing link between the apes and homo sapiens (man).

On page 68 she speaks of her enthusiasm for communism:

In fact, this declaration was something more than a mere automatic taking of opposite sides to Boud; the little I knew about the Fascists repelled me—their racism, super-militarism, brutality. I took out a subscription to the Daily Worker, bought volumes of Communist literature and literature that I supposed to be Communist, rigged up some homemade hammer and sickle flags.

She refers to her first husband, Esmond Romilly, on page 98 as follows:

Esmond's abrupt conversion to Communist ideas had come about in a way very similar to my own.

On page 190 she expresses her lack of knowledge of economics by stating: